DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 269 905 EA 018 522

AUTHOR Ballantyne, Marina; And Others
TITLE A Comparative Study of Public and Private Schools in the San Francisco Bay Area: A Descriptive Report.
INSTITUTION Stanford Univ., Calif. Inst. for Research on Educational Finance and Governance.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO IFG-PR-84-A17
PUB DATE Nov 84
GRANT NIE-G-83-0003
NOTE 309p.; For other documents in this study, see EA 018 521-523. Appendices contain small print.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC13 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Charts; Comparative Analysis; Data Analysis; Data Collection; Elementary Secondary Education; Institutional Characteristics; *Private Schools; *Public Schools; *Research Methodology; School Demography; School Organization; *School Statistics; *School Surveys; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS California (San Francisco Bay Area); San Francisco Unified School District CA

ABSTRACT

The Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance (IFG) has designed and implemented a major survey of public and private schools in the six-county San Francisco Bay Area which focuses on organizational dimensions in elementary and secondary schools. Private schools include Catholic parochial and private schools, independent schools, and schools of different religious affiliations. A survey of principals and teachers in the sample schools was also conducted to determine similarities and differences among personnel in the public and private sector. This paper describes the data set resulting from the surveys of schools, teachers, and principals in the public and private sectors. Sample design, rates of return, and the majority of variables in both the school and personnel files are discussed in detail and illustrated in tables. Initial comparisons between public and private schools are highlighted, but will require further analysis of the data set to verify. Appendices consist of school, personnel and District questionnaires and cover letters; an analysis of school and personnel file weights; and tables on the influence of various constituencies on decision making. (Author/TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

EA

ED269905

IFG

Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION STANFORD UNIVERSITY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Project Report No. 84-A17

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS IN THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA: A DESCRIPTIVE REPORT

Marina Ballantyne
Jay G. Chambers
Susanne Lajoie

November 1984

Marina Ballantyne and Susanne Lajoie are graduate students in the School of Education at Stanford University.

Jay G. Chambers is a Senior Research Economist at the Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance, Stanford University.

The research for this report was supported by funds from the National Institute of Education (Grant No. NIE-G-83-0003). The analysis and conclusions do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of this organization.

EA 018 522

INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH ON EDUCATIONAL FINANCE AND GOVERNANCE

The Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance is a Research and Development Center of the National Institute of Education (NIE) and is authorized and funded under authority of Section 405 of the General Education Provisions Act as amended by Section 403 of the Education Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-482). The Institute is administered through the School of Education at Stanford University and is located in the Center for Educational Research at Stanford (CERAS).

The research activity of the institute is divided into the following program areas: Finance and Economics; Politics; Law; and Organizations. In addition, there are a number of other projects and programs in the finance and governance area that are sponsored by private foundations and government agencies which are outside of the special R&D Center relationship with NIE.

Abstract

IFG designed and implemented a major survey of public and private schools in the six county San Francisco Bay Area which focuses on organizational dimensions in elementary and secondary schools. Private schools in this study include Catholic parochial and private schools, independent schools and schools of different religious affiliations. Furthermore, a survey of principals and teachers in the sample schools was conducted to determine similarities and differences among personnel in the public and private sector. The sampling was extensive: 563 public and 374 private schools and principals received questionnaires; 2471 public and 2688 private school teachers were surveyed. However, the return rate was modest.

This paper describes the data set resulting from the surveys of schools, teachers and principals in the public and private sectors. Sample design, rates of return, and the majority of variables in both the school and personnel files are discussed in detail and illustrated in tables. Initial comparisons between public and private schools are highlighted, but will require further analysis of the data set to verify.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. INTRODUCTION 1

A. Policy Context for the Study of Public and Private Schools 1

B. Overview of the IFG Study of Public and Private Schools 4

C. Purpose and Organization of this Report 9

II. SAMPLE DESIGN AND DATA COLLECTION 12

A. Sample Design and Rationale 12

B. Return Rates 22

C. Comparison of Respondents and Nonrespondents 24

D. Data Sources 36

E. Summary of the Data Bases Developed from this Study 41

III. HIGHLIGHTS 46

A. School File 46

B. Personnel File 51

IV. DESCRIPTION OF THE SCHOOL FILE 58

A. Introduction 58

B. Basic School Characteristics 60

C. Student Characteristics 66

D. Staffing Patterns and Staff Compensation 72

E. School Philosophy and Practices 92

F. School Governance and Environment 107

G. Government Programs 119

H. School Finance and Budgets 125

V PERSONNEL TABLES 131

A. Introduction 131

B. Educational Preparation 132

C. Background Information 154

D. Attitudes Toward the Profession 176

E. Employment Information 195

F. Terms of Employment 210

G. Compensation 222

APPENDIX

A SCHOOL, PERSONNEL AND DISTRICT QUESTIONNAIRES AND COVER LETTERS 248

B SCHOOL AND PERSONNEL FILE WEIGHTS 294

C TABLES ON INFLUENCE OF VARIOUS CONSTITUENCIES ON DECISION-MAKING 299

I. Introduction

A. Policy Context for the Study of Public and Private Schools

The condition of American education has not received as much national attention since the reaction to Sputnik in the late 1950s. National commissions are producing reports at a rapid rate: "A Nation at Risk ", commissioned by the U.S. Secretary of Education; "High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America", commissioned by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. In these and other reports, researchers and policymakers express concern over the quality of American education and the perceived decline in confidence in public schools.

Public school officials resemble jugglers as they balance the demands of both government and varied individual constituents. They face increased centralization of educational funding at both state and federal levels. Demands from various interest groups have led to an increase in categorical programs which provide funding for special groups. As a result, the administration of the public school system is more complex, especially for districts serving special student populations. These increases in complexity and centralization have met with accusations of insufficient coordination across multiple educational programs and ineffective use of public funds. Many argue that public schools lack sufficient incentive to promote the efficient use of resources. Parents speak of feelings of alienation and express dissatisfaction with academic standards, lack of discipline, and obstacles to expression of choice.

As dissatisfaction with public schools increases, more parents will choose alternative forms of education in the private sector. One study has shown a fifty-three percent increase in enrollments in non-

7

Catholic portions of the private sector (Cooper, et al., 1977). Although the overall ratio of public and private school enrollment in grades 1-12 has remained fairly constant over the last three years, the percent of kindergarteners enrolled in private schools has increased from 7.6 percent in 1979 to 12.8 percent in 1981.(Statistical Abstract of the U.S., P.137). Dissatisfied parents become concerned educational consumers.

The privatization of schooling emerges, then, as a major issue in the discussions of the quality of American education. Policymakers are forced to consider ways of establishing greater parental control over the educational experience of their children. Policy debates over this issue have included the following alternatives: deregulation and defederalization of public education; consolidation of categorical grant programs; decentralization of decision making; heavier reliance on private education; and increased competition among schools. Already, rules and regulations for the control of categorical grant programs have been relaxed to leave room for greater state and local discretion. Some categorical programs have been consolidated to reduce administrative complexity and increase the efficiency in the allocation of educational dollars. Public support of private education through tuition tax credits has received considerable attention as a way of increasing parental choice of access to school alternatives and thereby increasing competition through the growth of private provision of educational services.

Ultimately, the resolution of these policy debates will require an increased understanding of how schools will function under alternative configurations of rules, regulations, and organizational arrangements. The study of public and private schools provides a natural experiment in which one can observe the differences in school operations as they relate to specific differences in the environments within which they function. Yet no comprehensive studies of private or public schooling organizations have been done that focus on these organizational dimensions. For example, the Abramowitz (1981) study in its examination of private and public high schools fails by design to examine elementary schools. Yet, it is at the elementary school level that most federal and state programmatic aid for public and private education has been directed. While the recent Coleman report (1981) expanded the scope of coverage to include a wide range of schools and output measures, it did not examine the diversity of non-Catholic private schools. Yet, this is the area of real growth and differentiation among private schools. Moreover, of the schools examined, little attention was paid by Coleman to the range of organizational variables of importance to policymakers and researchers seeking to differentiate among private and public educational suppliers. Similarly, other studies like those pursued by Erickson (1978) paid little attention to the organization of schools in their examination of parent/consumer demand. And none of these studies has attempted to synthesize the varied (often competing) perspectives of the social science disciplines.

As part of its research program on Alternative Structures of School Governance, the Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance undertook the development of a data base that would permit the examination of organizational differences in public and private schools. Public and private schools have much in common in terms of their range of goals as well as specialized objectives, but they appear to function in different ways and have different emphases. The IFG study represents an attempt to understand how schooling organizations address common problems and how they address ones unique to their concerns. Central to the study is a question: how might successful practices for one set of institutions be considered and implemented by the other? What lessons can each sector learn from the other?

The main obstacle that has challenged this inquiry in the past has been the lack of data. Very little data have been collected in any systematic fashion on private schools, and no attempt has been made in the past to do a rigorous comparative analysis. Organizational dimensions have largely been neglected in previous studies in this area.

To redress these gaps in the literature, the IFG designed and implemented a major survey of public and private schools in the San

Francisco Bay Area that encompassed both public and private schools in all major private school groupings. This research effort examines organizational differences in elementary and secondary schools in both sectors. Private schools in this study include Catholic schools, independent schools and schools of different religious affiliations. Furthermore, the study examines similarities and differences among personnel, including principals and teachers, in the public and private sectors.

Few studies exist on the subject which are as comprehensive as this IFG study comparing public and private schools. The sampling was extensive: 563 public and 370 private schools and principals received questionnaires; 2,603 public and 2,896 private school teachers were surveyed. Return rates were modest: 129 public and 131 private schools responded: 278 principals replied; 466 public and 572 private school teachers returned questionnaires.

Although the data presented in this report are by no means conclusive, the reader can begin to draw interesting comparisons which may verify or dispell many of the myths about differences between public and private schools. The study is intended to inform the researchers and policy makers debating such issues as the privatization of schooling and the general quality of American education today.

B. Overview of the IFG Study of Public and Private Schools

There are many issues which can be addressed by observing differences in the operations and functioning of public and private schools. The range of differences in ownership, management, and organizational structures of schools needs to be explored. We need to understand the nature of the competitive pressures (or lack thereof) between and among public and private schools. We should explore the factors which affect patterns of decisionmaking and management practices as well as the goals and objectives of schools. How do external linkages and regulations affect levels and combinations of services, costs and administrative burdens? What differences in the types and quantities of personnel and non-personnel resources emerge and to what extent are they a function of ownership and management or competitive pressures? What might the implications of these various organizational effects be under alternative arrangements for public support of private education? An increased understanding of these various factors will better prepare us to assess the impact of such policy alternatives as the deregulation of public schools, the decentralization of decision making, and increased reliance on private alternatives.

The IFG project is an applied research study intended to contribute concrete knowledge to the policy debates concerning public and private schools. Its purpose is to explore and to provide some insights into the organizational structures, the patterns of decision making and resource allocation in various types of schools. It will also identify patterns of compensation and employment among personnel in these two sectors. The members of the public/private project all have a common interest in understanding how organizations function in different environments and a more specific interest in the operation of the educational enterprise.

It is not the intent of the study to examine private and public schools in terms of school effectiveness. The original design of the IFG study and the resulting data base do not include measures of educational outcomes. The study makes no claims about what educational inputs produce the highest levels of student achievement. No conclusions will be reached which suggest that one form of schooling is better than another. IFG is interested in clarifying the structure of the private and public schooling organizations before it looks at the outcomes of such institutional differences.

The overall project consists of a series of studies undertaken from the perspectives of three social science disciplines: economics, political science, and sociology. This series of multi-disciplinary studies uses a common, comparative, methodological approach designed to increase our understanding of variations in the patterns of organizational control and operation of schools. Each study will draw upon the same comprehensive IFG data base on public and private schools described in this report. The studies will be comparative in nature, exploring differences between and within the public and private sectors.

Each project will examine organizational structures and patterns of decision making and resource allocation in schools which vary along the following dimensions: 1) the degree of competition; 2) levels and types of funding and support; 3) the nature of governmental regulation and organizational control; 4) structures of ownership and management; 5) the types of students served; and 6) educational goals and objectives.

Thus far, five analytical reports have been produced under this project. To give the reader a flavor for the analytical potential of the data base, these five reports are listed below along with their repective abstracts.

1. "Race and Educational Employment: Public and Catholic Schools Compared" (Dennis J. Encarnation and Craig E. Richards)

ABSTRACT: Today, another restructuring of the operations of government is underway -- a reponse to the perceived failure of earlier government-initiated social reforms. Since state and federal education programs have been at the center of the new reforms, there are important implications for the continued reduction and redirection of educational funding and regulation on the future employment prospects of minority teachers in public and Catholic schools. This study explores within sector variations in minority employment in public and Catholic schools.

The present study is both geographically and ocupationally specific: we examine patterns of employment for elementary and secondary teachers in public and Catholic schools operating in the six counties surrounding San Francisco Bay. Operating within the constraints of available data, this report explores several environmental determinants of minority employment in public and Catholic schools. Employing an open systems model of service delivery, the present study reassesses the ability of that model to explain variation in minority teacher

employment across public and Catholic schools. Subsequently we present a more detailed analysis of the different employment experiences of Black and Hispanic teachers within public and Catholic schools. Finally, the results of these two sets of analyses form the basis for a discussion of general conclusions and policy implications.

2. "Social Policy and Minority Employment in Public, Catholic and Private Schools" (Dennis J. Encarnation and Craig Richards)

ABSTRACT: The role of nonpublic schools in American education has emerged as an important policy issue over the last decade. Currently, a variety of federal, state and local programs already provide public financial support to private schools and their students. The paper explores the relative impact of selected government programs on a narrowly defined set of school operations. An open systems model is developed, in the context of which the effects of government programs on school operations can be identified. The focus throughout is on factors that account for variation in racial staffing patterns between public, Catholic and private schools.

3. "Environmental Linkages and Organizational Complexity: Public and Private Schools" (W. Richard Scott and John W. Meyer)

ABSTRACT: The environment within which an organization must operate is expected to influence its administrative and program characteristics. Since public schools operate in more complex and conflicting environments than do private schools, it is predicted that they will exhibit greater administrative complexity and less curricular coherence. These predictions are tested and largely confirmed by a review of previous research and in a new study utilizing data from a six-county survey of a sample of private, public and parochial schools and districts in the San Francisco Bay Area.

4. "Toward an Institutional-Contingency View of School Organization" (Joan E. Talbert)

ABSTRACT: This study assesses an institutional-contingency view of school organization which emphasizes differences in authority principles and organization norms within the specialized environments of public, religious and non-religious private schools. Using data from a survey of the San francisco Bay Area public and private schools, we assess the organizational distinctness of the three sectors and the nature of differences in organizing tendencies. We also test the notion that sectors show different patterns of correlations among organization variables and analyze correlates of a social climate index by sector and including sector as variable. We find mixed support for arguments regarding the particular nature of organizational differences among the sectors but the data do reveal an expected clustering of organization tendencies within public, religious and non-religious sectors and substantially divergent correlations among organization variables. These results suggest the potential value of an institutional-contingency model of school organization and they caution against research or educational policy which assumes that a particular governance practice has a common meaning and consequences among public, religious and non-religious private schools.

5. "Patterns of Compensation of Public and Private School Teachers" (Jay G. Chambers, Project Director)

ABSTRACT: General impressions suggest that public school teachers are paid higher salaries than private school teachers. Indeed, the evidence is consistent with this general impression. But why the difference? Do public school teachers have better qualifications? Are private schools better places in which to work, and are they able to pay lower wages for comparable teachers? Do public and private schools even operate in the same market for teaching personnel? Are those individuals who seek employment in the private school sector from the

same population as those seeking public school employment? What part does the ownership structure of the school play in the determination of teacher compensation? It is the purpose of this paper to provide some insights into these and related questions about the patterns of variation in compensation of public and private school teachers.

Our findings reveal that public school teachers earn more than teachers in nonpublic schools. Teachers in parochial schools are the lowest paid, while teachers in nonsectarian private schools are the highest paid among nonpublic school teachers. There appear to be structural differences in the patterns of wage variation between the different sectors. Public school teachers possess greater quantities of those characteristics that are valued in the market than nonpublic school teachers. Nonpublic school teachers sacrifice somewhere between 10% and 40% of the public school teacher salary to work in the nonpublic sector (depending on type of school within the nonpublic sector) and they are aware of their sacrifice. Finally, organizational and ownership structure of the school also appears to make a difference in salaries with profit making schools being among the lowest paying second only to parochial schools.

* * * * *

These projects have drawn upon a common data base suitable for comparing the organization and dynamics of public and private schools. The different studies produced their own research products, but they were coordinated during the initial years through regular workshops and seminars in which participants shared information and ideas. Taken together, these studies explore different organizational dimensions of public and private schools in a comparative framework.

C. Purpose and organization of this report.

The purpose of this report is to provide a description of IFG data collection activity and the resulting data base that has been developed. These data should permit a comprehensive study of public and private school organizations.

During the 1981/1982 fiscal years, the project team devoted its energies to data collection. This activity consisted of five related components: 1) an outline of data needs; 2) an assessment of alternative data sources; 3) design of survey instruments to allow the gathering of data not readily available from other sources; 4) sample specification; and 5) negotiation of access to various school constituencies. These activities were not conducted independently; each component contributes and, of necessity, is developed in relation to progress on the other four. Sample design, for example, depends critically upon the conceptual frameworks which inform the development of the survey instruments and upon data availability. The survey instruments were developed in consultation with representatives of school constituencies who assisted us in gaining access to the schools themselves.

This report will reveal some basic differences and similarities in public and private schools classified according to our sample design. Its main purpose is to serve as a guide to the various components of the database gathered by IFG during the course of the study. The report is descriptive in nature; the authors have not tested any hypotheses and therefore will not report the levels of statistical significance for any of the findings. Further analysis of the data is required to verify many of the general observations reported here. Interpretations of the data are intentionally minimized. Readers are encouraged to test their own conceptions of the differences and similarities in public and private schools against this extensive data base, and discover opportunities for further research using these data.

The organization of this report follows a simple format to facilitate presentation of the material:

I. Introduction

II. Sample design, sample response rates and data sources

III. Highlights from the School and Personnel Files

IV. Descriptions and tables of variables in the School File

V. Descriptions and tables of variables in the Personnel File

VI. Appendices, containing school and personnel questionnaires and accompanying cover letters.

II. Sample Design and Data Collection.

It is important to recognize that the sample design was developed to meet the needs of the five primary studies for which this data base was created. The research questions addressed by the IFG projects necessitated gathering data on school organization and operations from public and private schools at both the district and school level. The Encarnation and Richards study required data from schools and districts regarding participation and involvement in public programs and the nature of regulatory controls resulting from such participation. Data on minority employment patterns in the different sectors was also collected.

The Scott and Meyer study relied primarily on school and district level data to study the administrative complexity and the coherence of educational policies and programs which are implemented in public and private school organizations. Talbert's study required school level data on management perceptions of school success and the dimensions of the school that led to success. Data describing policies employed by school managers to achieve their stated goals and objectives was collected.

Chambers' study of compensation and employment necessitated an additional dimension to the data collection: data on individual school personnel. The methodology required data on individual teachers and principals describing their personal and job characteristics, as well as their terms and conditions of employment and compensation.

This section is devoted to describing the design and rationale of the public and private samples, return rates, and data sources.

A. Sample Design and Rationale

The samples of schools and school districts come from the six county San Francisco Bay Area. Specifically this includes the counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Francisco, San Mateo and Santa Clara. We have three primary reasons for focusing on the Bay Area: 1) we find a variety of private as well as public schools representing diverse student populations, religious affiliations, and emphases; 2) there are sufficient numbers of schools to permit adequate samples, assuming modest return rates, for statistical analysis; and 3) logistical and budgetary considerations would have limited our ability to follow-up on a sample spread over a larger geographic area.

There are three basic levels in the sample design: district, school and individual personnel. The samples contained in each of these respective levels are described below.

(1) Public School Districts

All of the approximately 110 public school districts in the six counties were sent a PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT QUESTIONNAIRE. The purposes for the district questionnaire were to match school and district responses and to provide some overall information on the context within which public schools are operating. The population of school districts is by nature a diverse sample, varying in size, scope, and types of students served. About 33% of the 110 school districts, or 36 school districts, returned questionnaires. Most of the variables from district questionnaires were matched to corresponding public school respondents and are on the school file. District data will not be discussed separately.

(2) Schools

(a) Public Schools

There are approximately 1,200 public elementary, intermediate, junior high and high schools in the six county Bay Area. We sampled close to half of these, selecting just over 550 schools. A stratified sample was developed to meet two important requirements: that adequate numbers of various types of schools were represented in the sample and that the greatest number of public school districts would be represented by those schools selected. Schools within each strata were selected randomly. Table II.1 shows the sample design and the response rates for public school and principal questionnaires.

TABLE II.1

SAMPLES AND RETURNS FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND PRINCIPALS

CAT	PUBLIC SCHOOL TYPE	SCHOOL POPULATION	# OF SCHOOLS IN SAMPLE	% OF SCHOOLS IN SAMPLE	RESPONSE -SCHOOL QUESTION.	% RESPONSE -SCHOOL QUESTION.	RESPONSE -PRINCIPAL QUESTION.	% RESPONSE -PRINCIPAL QUESTION.
	OVERALL	1231	563	45.74	129	22.91	162	28.77
1	HIGH SCHOOLS	153	153	100.00	43	28.10	48	31.37
2	JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS	73	37	50.68	11	29.73	14	37.84
3	INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS	90	45	50.00	8	17.78	18	40.00
4	1-6 ELEM SCHOOLS	173	135	78.03	28	20.74	37	27.41
5	7-11 ELEM SCHOOLS	172	52	30.23	18	34.62	20	38.46
6	12-20 ELEM SCHOOLS	202	61	30.20	7	11.48	14	22.95
7	GT 20 ELEM SCHOOLS	339	51	15.04	8	15.69	10	19.61
8	ADDITIONS	29	29	100.00	6	20.69	1	3.45

Note the differences in percentages of the schools selected in each stratum. We selected 100% of the public high schools because of the focus on secondary schools in the Meyer and Scott project. Furthermore, it ensured that all high school districts would have at least one school included in the sample. Fifty percent of both junior high and intermediate schools were included in the sample. These high percentages improved the probability that a relatively large portion of the elementary districts would be represented by at least one school in our sample.

The elementary schools were divided into four categories which varied according to the number of elementary schools within a district. The selection of these categories was based on an examination of the distribution of districts according to the number of elementary schools. Natural break-points were identified in this distribution to determine categories 4 through 7 in Table II.1.

Elementary schools in large districts (over 6 elementary schools) were under-represented; those in smaller districts were over-represented. This design was chosen to maximize the number of individual public school districts represented in the sample. Our sample percentages in three elementary school categories (5,6 and 7 in Table II.1) yielded approximately equal numbers of schools to be selected from the districts represented in these categories. These three categories include approximately 17%, 12%, and 7%, respectively, of the total number of districts in the six counties. However, just over 50% of the districts were represented among the schools in category 4 -- districts with 1 to 6 elementary schools. (Note that the remaining 14% of the districts were high school districts and do not contain elementary schools.) Thus, we selected a much higher percentage (78%) of the elementary schools in districts with 1 to 6 elementary schools to maximize the number of individual districts.

Category 8 represents schools that were added to the public school samples after the fact. Most of these schools are continuation schools or vocational/technical schools. A small number of regular high schools are included in this category. These schools were surveyed primarily at the suggestion and request of the larger districts who noted their exclusion during our discussions with them regarding permission to survey their schools. They have been reported in the Tables as a separate category to highlight the fact that they were not included as part of the original sample design. We added them to the sample schools because we received school questionnaires from some of these schools.

(b) Private Schools

Surprisingly, the number of private schools in the six county Bay Area rivals the total of public schools. There are more than 1,000 private schools in this area. We decided to limit the private schools included in our sample to those schools with an enrollment in excess of 50 students. This eliminated more than 60% of the total population of private schools.

We eliminated these small schools for several reasons. First, they represent very idiosyncratic cases that would be difficult to analyze in comparison to other schooling organizations. In many cases these schools are literally operated in the basements of [illegible] homes and often involve fewer than ten children. Second, these schools do not represent the stable environment of private schools attended by the majority of private school enrollees. Third, our budgetary constraints necessitated limiting the size and diversity of the population of private schools. By eliminating this group of schools with enrollments of less than 50 , the IFG sample will represent the types of schools attended by the vast majority of private school students in the Bay Area.

Our private school sample then consists of all of the private schools (the entire private school population) within the six county Bay Area which enroll more than 50 students. Table II.2 describes the nature of this sample. The schools are categorized first by religious or organizational affiliation into four broad areas: 1) Catholic Parochial 2) Catholic Private 3) Other Religious, and 4) Nonsectarian. The distinction between Catholic parochial and private schools is made by the Catholic community. Put very simply, parochial schools are operated directly by the Dioceses; private Catholic schools are operated by various religious orders. It is interesting to note that the Catholic sector accounts for over 50% of the total number of nonpublic schools in the Bay Area sample. The 'Other Religious' category includes any school with a religious affiliation other than Catholic. Nonsectarian schools, commonly called independent schools, have no religious affiliation. Within these four broad categories, the schools are further subdivided by school level: elementary, secondary and the K-12 combination seen in many non-sectarian schools.

It is important to note that the private school sample was not stratified according to these categories. The entire population of private schools described above was, in fact, selected. These categories are displayed because the teacher sample discussed in Section (3) was stratified according to these categories.

TABLE II.2

SAMPLES AND RETURNS FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS AND PRINCIPALS

CAT	PRIVATE SCHOOL TYPE	SCHOOL POPULATION	RESPONSE -SCHOOL QUESTION.	% RESPONSE -SCHOOL QUESTION.	RESPONSE -PRINCIPAL QUESTION.	% RESPONSE -PRINCIPAL QUESTION.
	OVERALL	370	131	35.41	116	31.35
1	CATH PAR, ELEM	150	69	46.00	55	36.67
2	CATH PAR, SEC	13	5	38.46	6	46.15
3	CATH PRIV, ELEM	6	1	16.67	0	0.00
4	CATH PRIV, SEC	23	5	21.74	7	30.43
5	OTHER RELIG, ELEM	62	15	24.19	17	27.42
6	OTHER RELIG, SEC	8	2	25.00	1	12.50
7	OTHER RELIG, K-12, UNGR	16	4	25.00	2	12.50
8	NON-SECTARIAN, ELEM	56	15	26.79	13	23.21
9	NON-SECTARIAN, SEC	17	9	52.94	10	58.82
10	NON-SECTARIAN, K-12, UNGR	19	6	31.58	5	26.32

(c) The Dominican Schools

Results from the sample of schools operated by the Catholic Order of Dominican Sisters in the six county Bay Area are included in the Catholic Private category but merit a special mention here. We sampled the entire population of the Catholic schools from the Dominican order as a result of fortuitous events. The IFG was contacted by the Superintendent of the Dominican Order of Catholic Schools in California who inquired about our study of public and private schools and expressed interest in directly participating in the study. We viewed this as an opportunity to increase our response rate since about one-third of the Dominican schools were already included in our school and principal samples, and five of them were included in our original teacher sample. The IFG provided the school, principal, and teacher questionnaires to the Superintendent who administered the survey to all of the Dominican schools within the state, both those within and beyond the sample counties. These surveys were sent out under a cover letter from the Superintendent of the Dominican Order.

The results of this survey were tremendously gratifying. Tables II.3 and II.4 show the unusually high participation and response rates of the Dominican schools for the various questionnaires. The response rates for the Dominican schools were over 90% in all categories; response rates for Dominican principals and teachers were over 50% in all categories. We want to point out that only the responses from the Dominican Schools in our original sample were included in the data base described in this report.

TABLE II.3

SAMPLES AND RETURNS FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS AND PRINCIPALS: DOMINICAN ONLY

SCHPOP=SCHOOL POPULATION, SCHRET=#SCHOOL QUEST RETURNED. PRINRET=#PRIN QUEST RETURNED

CATEGORY	SCHPOP	SCHRET	%SCHRET	PRINRET	%PRINRET
OVERALL	27	26	96.30	23	85.19
CATH PAR, ELEM	9	9	100.00	8	88.89
CATH PAR, SEC	1	1	100.00	1	100.00
CATH PRIV, ELEM	12	11	91.67	10	83.33
CATH PRIV, SEC	5	5	100.00	4	80.00

TABLE II.4

PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHER SAMPLES AND RETURNS: DOMINICAN ONLY
SCHPOP = #SCHOOLS SAMPLED, TCHRSAM=#SCHOOLS IN TEACHER SAMPLE, RETTCH=#SCHOOLS WHERE NTCHRET>0
ESTNTCH=#TEACHERS IN SAMPLE, NTCHRET=#TEACHER QUEST RETURNED

CATEGORY	SCHPOP	TCHRSAM	%TCHRSAM	RETTCH	%RETTCH	ESTNTCH	NTCHRET	%NTCHRET
OVERALL	27	27	100	27	100	357	210	58.82
CATH PAR, ELEM	9	9	100	9	100	104	60	57.69
CATH PAR, SEC	1	1	100	1	100	21	13	61.90
CATH PRIV, ELEM	12	12	100	12	100	112	67	59.82
CATH PRIV, SEC	5	5	100	5	100	120	70	58.33

(3) School Personnel

Two categories of school personnel were sampled: school principals/heads and teachers. The sample of school principals/heads includes 100 percent of the public and private school principals/heads at schools selected for the public and private school samples described above. Essentially it includes the principals and heads from the entire population of private schools with enrollments greater than 50, and the 563 public schools selected in the stratified sample.

A cluster sampling technique was used to select teachers. We were unable to obtain the names of individual teachers from either the public or private sector and therefore were forced to sample on the basis of schools rather than individuals. The teacher samples are drawn from a subset of the public and private schools included in the school surveys. This subset consists of about 100 public and 160 private schools. When a particular school was selected for the sample, all of the teachers in that school were sent teacher questionnaires. As a result, approximately 2,700 teachers were surveyed in each sector for a total of about 5,400.

These subsets and the subsequent teacher samples were selected to satisfy several criteria. First, we desired approximately equal numbers of elementary and secondary teachers from both the public and private sectors. Elementary levels included any grade combination in the K-8 range; secondary schools consisted of both junior high and high schools. Second, we wanted to include as many public school districts as possible in order to effectively capture variations in scheduled salaries which are specified at the district level. We accomplished this objective in two ways. We selected a disproportionately large number of schools from districts with fewer elementary schools to maximize the number of individual districts. Also, fewer schools were selected from among intermediate, junior high and high schools. Their large size and subsequent greater numbers of teachers per school would have created an imbalance between secondary and elementary teachers and reduced the total number of schools in our sample. This would have reduced the degrees of freedom with respect to both school and district level variables, adversely affecting any statistical analyses.

Third, we wanted to reduce the potential effects the religious orientation of so many private schools might have on our analyses of labor markets, hiring practices, and market competition. To do this, we over-represented both Catholic parochial and non-sectarian schools in our teacher sample. We selected approximately 1,000 teachers from Catholic parochial schools and about 500 from each of the other three types: Catholic private, other religious, and nonsectarian schools. Although the Catholic sector would have been sufficiently represented by fewer teachers, we doubled the required number, anticipating that only half of the teachers would be lay teachers.

The nonsectarian schools were over-represented in the teacher sample because we felt their educational missions and practices were more varied and in some ways distinctive from their religious counterparts. Such variety is useful to researchers, particularly when comparing private and public schools to assess the effects of market competition on employment and compensation patterns and other school practices. We were concerned that the religious orientation of schools might exert specific and systematic influences on hiring patterns. We wanted to examine hiring patterns with and without these potential effects. Private schools which were designated as either ungraded or K-12 were excluded from the private school teacher samples because of the potential difficulty in comparisons with the public sector.

Tables II.5 and II.6 contain the samples and return rates for public and private school teachers. Both displays use the categories previously described in the text. The public school teacher sample was stratified according to the same design used for the public school sample in Table II.1; the private school teacher sample was stratified by religious/organizational affiliation and grade level. As the criteria above suggest, we attempted to achieve some balance of numbers of schools and teachers in selecting our samples. Various sampling percentages were tried until we were successful in satisfying our various criteria. Moreover, all sampling percentages or numbers were selected with full knowledge that only partial response would be forthcoming.

TABLE II.5

PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHER SAMPLES AND RETURNS

CAT	PUBLIC SCHOOL TYPE	POPULATION* OF SCHOOLS FROM WHICH SAMPLE SCH WERE SELECTED	NUMBER (%) OF SCHOOLS IN TEACHER SAMPLE	NO. (%) OF SCHOOLS RETURNING AT LEAST 1 TCHR QUEST	ESTIMATED TOTAL NO. TEACHERS IN POPULATION SCHOOLS	ESTIMATED TOTAL NO. (%) TEACHERS IN SAMPLE SCHOOLS	NO. (%) OF TEACHERS RETURNING SURVEY
	OVERALL	563	105 (18.65%)	72 (68.57%)	16423	2603 (15.85%)	466 (17.90%)
1	HIGH SCHOOLS	153	19 (12.42%)	11 (57.89%)	8653	1003 (11.59%)	181 (18.05%)
2	JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS	37	4 (10.81%)	4(100.00%)	1268	158 (12.46%)	30 (18.99%)
3	INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS	45	7 (15.56%)	5 (71.43%)	1381	234 (16.94%)	20 (8.55%)
4	1-6 ELEM SCHOOLS	135	34 (25.19%)	23 (67.65%)	2097	473 (22.57%)	94 (19.87%)
5	7-11 ELEM SCHOOLS	52	15 (28.85%)	11 (73.33%)	988	289 (29.25%)	43 (14.88%)
6	12-20 ELEM SCHOOLS	61	16 (26.23%)	11 (68.75%)	983	274 (27.87%)	48 (17.52%)
7	GT 20 ELEM SCHOOLS	51	10 (19.61%)	7 (70.00%)	78	172 (21.91%)	50 (29.07%)

*The POPULATION from which the teacher sample was selected in the public sector consisted only of those schools that were included among the school level sample and were sent school level questionnaires as part of the overall study.

* * *

TABLE II.6

PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHER SAMPLES AND RETURNS

CAT	PRIVATE SCHOOL TYPE	POPULATION OF SCHOOLS FROM WHICH SAMPLE SCH WERE SELECTED	NUMBER (%) OF SCHOOLS IN TEACHER SAMPLE	NO. (%) OF SCHOOLS RETURNING AT LEAST 1 TCHR QUEST	ESTIMATED TOTAL NO. TEACHERS IN POPULATION SCHOOLS	ESTIMATED TOTAL NO. (%) TEACHERS IN SAMPLE SCHOOLS	NO. (%) OF TEACHERS RETURNING SURVEY
	OVERALL	370	168 (45.41%)	97 (57.74%)	5688	2896 (50.91%)	576 (19.89%)
1	CATH PAR, ELEM	150	48 (32.00%)	36 (75.00%)	1640	638 (38.90%)	162 (25.39%)
2	CATH PAR, SEC	13	9 (69.23%)	7 (77.78%)	395	373 (94.43%)	65 (17.43%)
3	CATH PRIV, ELEM	6	6 (100.00%)	2 (33.33%)	136	136 (100 %)	2 (1.38%)
4	CATH PRIV, SEC	23	12 (52.17%)	12 (100.00%)	806	544 (67.49%)	158 (29.04%)
5	OTHER RELIG, ELEM	62	39 (62.90%)	14 (35.90%)	738	420 (56.91%)	35 (8.33%)
6	OTHER RELIG, SEC	8	5 (62.50%)	2 (40.00%)	135	91 (67.41%)	10 (10.99%)
7	NON-SECTARIAN, ELEM	56	34 (60.71%)	11 (32.35%)	902	401 (44.46%)	40 (9.98%)
8	NON-SECTARIAN, SEC	17	15 (88.24%)	13 (86.67%)	444	275 (61.94%)	104 (37.82%)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

B. Return Rates

(1) Schools

Although a fairly large number of schools were sampled, the response rates, except for the Dominican Schools, were relatively low. This low response rate (29%) may be due to several factors. In a study requiring such extensive data collection, it is often difficult to obtain the cooperation of a sampled population. Gaining the cooperation of some 933 schools and about 6400 individual school personnel without a common coordinating agency was a monumental task. Another obstacle to cooperation may have been the degree of competition, even if only perceived, among the individual institutions within and between each sector. Tables II.1 and II.2, displayed on pages 14 and 17 show the overall return rates for public and private schools.

The following patterns were observed in school response rates:

TYPE: Schools in the private sector exhibited a higher response rate: a 35% rate among private schools; a 23% rate among the public schools. Catholic Parochial elementary and nonsectarian secondary school showed the highest response rates, 46% and 53%, respectivley. The lowest return rates were among certain categories of public elementary schools.

LEVEL: Viewed as a group, secondary schools showed a slightly higher return rate than did elementary schools, 30% to about 27%. But 37% of private elementary schools responded, while 34% of private secondary schools returned questionnaires. The actual number of elementary schools that responded is greater than the number of secondary schools -- 169 public and private elementary schools responded compared to 75 secondary schools. It is interesting to note that, in the public sector, districts with greater than 12 elementary schools had the lowest return rates (about 13%); districts with 7-11 elementary schools had the highest return rates (35%).

(3) Personnel:

Principal return rates were also modest: 278 principals returned questionnaires out of a possible 933, a return rate of 30%. Each principal/head in the public and private school samples received a questionnaire. Only 19% of the schools sampled returned both school and principal questionnaires. Principal return rates were slightly higher -- about 1% -- than school rates. Principals in the private sector had an overall return rate about 2% higher than did those in the public sector. The highest return rates were for the Catholic parochial secondary (46%) and nonsectarian secondary (59%) schools. Return rates for secondary principal/heads were higher than for those in the elementary category: 32% to 29%. These results are contained in Tables II.1 and II.2, previously shown.

Our inability to obtain lists of names of teachers prevented us from surveying them directly. The IFG questionnaires had to be sent to a principal who ultimately made the decision as to whether to distribute them to his/her teachers. Even if they decided to distribute the first round questionnaires, our request to deliver a follow-up may not have received support. As a result, return rates were quite low. Only 1042 out of a possible 5499 returned the questionnaires, or about 19%. These results are presented in Tables II.5 and II.6 on page 21.

The following patterns should be noted:

TYPE: Teachers in both public and private sectors had an overall return rate of about 19%. The Catholic private and non-sectarian secondary schools had the highest return rates: 24% and 29%, respectively.

LEVEL: In the public sector, elementary and secondary teachers responded at about the same rate: 17%. However, the teacher response rates in the two levels in the private sector were quite different: 21% for secondary and only 9% for elementary. Only two Catholic private elementary teachers responded.

(4) SUMMARY

The following chart summarizes the return rates for schools and personnel:

	Public	Private	Elem.	Second.
SCHOOL RETURN RATES:	23% (129)	35%(131)	29%(179)	30%(81)
PRINCIPAL RETURNS:	29%(162)	31%(116)	29%(191)	32%(87)
TEACHER RETURNS:	18%(466)	20%(576)	16%(494)	22%(548)

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the actual number of respondents.

In the public sector, elementary schools consist of intermediate and elementary schools; junior high and high schools (including those in category 8) are classified as secondary schools. In the private sector, both elementary schools and the K-12 combinations are included in the elementary schools category, except in the case of teachers where no returns for the K-12 grade combination were reported.

As can be seen, overall reponse rates for the private sector were slightly higher than their public school counterparts. Secondary schools and their personnel also responded at slightly higher rates.

C. Comparison of Respondents and Non-respondents

Sample Bias. The Bay Area sample tends to over-represent schools serving middle- and upper-middle income, white, English-speaking families. This bias would tend to reduce differences in the socio-economic bases of the three sectors (public, non-public religious, and private independent). While we have no theoretical or common-sense reason to believe that this would influence the organizational and administration variables under study, we cannot rule out the possibility that this population bias would condition results of the empirical study. For example, it could be that organizational and/or administrative differences among sectors are enhanced in an environment where ethnic/class tensions are not central to family decisions about schools. Conversely, ethnicity/class-based tastes for school organization could affect greater convergence of organization/administration across sectors within such high SES populations. We cannot empirically assess such possibilities of interaction of the controlled population variables with sector on our school organization and administration variables. However, we will employ and recommend caution in generalizing research findings to more socially diverse school populations.

Two basic strategies are used by individual researchers to assess potential biases introduced by nonresponse to the survey: (1) comparisons of characteristics of sample schools who did and did not participate in the study and (2) comparisons of our response distributions on selected dependent variables with those obtained in prior studies using Bay Area school samples. We limit ourselves in this discussion to the first strategy.

After examining differences in overall response rates, we checked for any respondent biases which could affect the data set. We looked at the respondents versus nonrespondents among public and private schools and teachers at elementary and secondary levels to determine any systematic differences in respondents in the following areas: a)school type and level of instruction b) school size c) number of teachers per 100 pupils d) pupil ethnicity and e)location in the city or suburbs. Results and accompanying tables are presented below.

(a) SCHOOL TYPE AND LEVEL OF INSTRUCTION: Although we have pointed out that private and secondary schools have greater response rates overall, the differences are not as systematic within each category.

Tables II.7 show the variation in response rates by school type and level of instruction. Note that sometimes public schools have higher response rates than categories of private; the percent of respondents in some elementary school types is greater than that of corresponding secondary schools.

TABLE II.7: SCHOOL RETURN RATES CLASSIFIED BY SCHOOL TYPE AND LEVEL OF INSTRUCTION

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM
RESPONSE TO SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE										
RESPONDENT	69	20.1	69	46.0	1	16.7	19	24.4	21	28.0
NONRESPONDENT	275	79.9	81	54.0	5	83.3	59	75.6	54	72.0
TOTAL	344	100.0	150	100.0	6	100.0	78	100.0	75	100.0

TABLE II.7: SCHOOL RETURN RATES CLASSIFIED BY SCHOOL TYPE AND LEVEL OF INSTRUCTION

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM
RESPONSE TO SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE										
RESPONDENT	60	27.4	5	38.5	5	21.7	2	25.0	9	52.9
NONRESPONDENT	159	72.6	8	61.5	18	78.3	6	75.0	8	47.1
TOTAL	219	100.0	13	100.0	23	100.0	8	100.0	17	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(b) SCHOOL SIZE: There were no systematic differences between respondents and nonrespondents according to school size in either the public or private sectors. Mean school sizes for respondents and nonrespondents in public elementary schools were almost identical. Mean school size for public high school respondents was about 10% greater. There was much more variation in school size among private school respondents, as demonstrated by Tables II.8-9. Still, there was no bias for either larger or smaller schools to respond.

TABLE II.8: DIFFERENCES IN SCHOOL SIZE BETWEEN RESPONDENTS AND NONRESPONDENTS

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	PUBLIC SCHOOL STRATIFICATION										PUBLIC SCHOOL STRATIFICATION				
	INTERMEDI-ATE SCHOOLS		SCH IN DIST W/ 1-6 ELEM SCH		SCH IN DIST W/ 7-11 ELEM SCH		SCH IN DIST W/ 12-20 ELEM SCH		SCH IN DIST W/ > 20 ELEM SCH		INTER-MEDIA-TE SCHOO-LS	SCH IN DIST W/ 1-6 ELEM SCH	SCH IN DIST W/ 7-11 ELEM SCH	SCH IN DIST W/ 12-20 ELEM SCH	SCH IN DIST W/ > 20 ELEM SCH
											TOTAL SCH ENROL-LMENT	TOTAL SCH ENROL-LMENT	TOTAL SCH ENROL-LMENT	TOTAL SCH ENROL-LMENT	TOTAL SCH ENROL-LMENT
	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN
SCHOOL RESPONSE RE: ENROLLMENT															
RESPONDENT	8	17.8	28	20.7	18	34.6	7	11.5	8	15.7	590.9	333.3	455.9	490.3	382.3
NONRESPONDENT	37	82.2	107	79.3	34	65.4	54	88.5	43	84.3	658.3	312.5	451.1	374.6	354.7
TOTAL POPULATION	45	100.0	135	100.0	52	100.0	61	100.0	51	100.0	646.3	316.8	452.8	387.9	359.0

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	PUBLIC SCHOOL STRATIFICATION						PUBLIC SCHOOL STRATIFICATION		
	HIGH SCHOOLS		JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS		CONTINUAT-ION / TECHNICAL SCHOOLS		HIGH SCHOO-LS	JUNIOR HIGH SCHOO-LS	CONTI-NUATI-ON / TECHN-ICAL SCHOO-LS
							TOTAL SCH ENROL-LMENT	TOTAL SCH ENROL-LMENT	TOTAL SCH ENROL-LMENT
	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN
SCHOOL RESPONSE RE: ENROLLMENT									
RESPONDENT	43	28.1	11	29.7	6	20.7	1525.2	880.6	157.5
NONRESPONDENT	110	71.9	26	70.3	23	79.3	1285.5	697.3	262.1
TOTAL POPULATION	153	100.0	37	100.0	29	100.0	1352.8	751.8	240.5

TABLE II.9: DIFFERENCES IN PRIVATE SCHOOL SIZE BETWEEN RESPONDENTS AND NONRESPONDENTS

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	PRIVATE SCHOOL STRATIFICATION												PRIVATE SCHOOL STRATIFICATION					
													CATH PAR, ELEM	CATH PRIV, ELEM	OTHER RELI-G, ELEM	OTHER RELI-G, K-12, UNGR	NON-SECT-ARIA-N, ELEM	NON-SECT-ARIA-N, K-12, UNGR
	CATH PAR, ELEM		CATH PRIV, ELEM		OTHER RELIG, ELEM		OTHER RELIG, K-12, UNGR		NON-SECTARIAN, ELEM		NON-SECTARIAN, K-12, UNGR		TOTAL SCH ENRO-LLME-NT	TOTAL SCH ENRO-LLME-NT	TOTAL SCH ENRO-LLME-NT	TOTAL SCH ENRO-LLME-NT	TOTAL SCH ENRO-LLME-NT	TOTAL SCH ENRO-LLME-NT
	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN
SCHOOL RESPONSE RE: ENROLLMENT																		
RESPONDENT	69	46.0	1	16.7	15	24.2	4	25.0	15	26.8	6	31.6	300.0	188.0	142.3	407.5	217.3	208.7
NONRESPONDENT	81	54.0	5	83.3	47	75.8	12	75.0	41	73.2	13	68.4	308.3	284.2	198.1	135.4	146.0	93.5
TOTAL POPULATION	150	100.0	6	100.0	62	100.0	16	100.0	56	100.0	19	100.0	304.4	268.2	184.6	293.4	165.1	129.9

TABLE II.9: DIFFERENCES IN PRIVATE SCHOOL SIZE BETWEEN RESPONDENTS AND NONRESPONDENTS

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	PRIVATE SCHOOL STRATIFICATION								PRIVATE SCHOOL STRATIFICATION			
									CATH PAR, SEC	CATH PRIV, SEC	OTHER RELI-G, SEC	NON-SECT-ARIA-N, SEC
	CATH PAR, SEC		CATH PRIV, SEC		OTHER RELIG, SEC		NON-SECTARIAN, SEC		TOTAL SCH ENRO-LLME-NT	TOTAL SCH ENRO-LLME-NT	TOTAL SCH ENRO-LLME-NT	TOTAL SCH ENRO-LLME-NT
	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN
SCHOOL RESPONSE RE: ENROLLMENT												
RESPONDENT	5	38.5	5	21.7	2	25.0	9	52.9	834.0	521.6	166.0	273.2
NONRESPONDENT	8	61.5	18	78.3	6	75.0	8	47.1	444.3	624.3	183.5	153.5
TOTAL POPULATION	13	100.0	23	100.0	8	100.0	17	100.0	594.5	602.0	179.1	216.9

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(c) TEACHERS PER 100 PUPILS: Again, the respondents and nonrespondents in both sectors showed no systematic bias according to the number of teachers per 100 pupils. In the public sector, each school which did or did not respond had a ratio of 4 or 5 teachers per 100 students. This lack of a variation in our results could be attributed to the uniformity in teacher pupil ratios among public schools. On the other hand, variation in the private sector was much greater, as illustrated in Tables II.10-11. Teachers per 100 students ranged from 2.9 to 15.9 .The largest discrepancy between respondents and nonrespondents in this category is among nonsectarian schools, secondary and K-12, where there is more variation in teacher pupil ratios and, also, fewer respondents. The nonsectarian repondents had fewer teachers per 100 pupils than did nonrespondents.

TABLE II.10: DIFFERENCES IN NUMBER OF TEACHERS PER 100 PUPILS BETWEEN RESPONDENT AND NONRESPONDENT PUBLIC SCHOOLS

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	PUBLIC SCHOOL STRATIFICATION										PUBLIC SCHOOL STRATIFICATION					
											INTERMEDIA-TE SCHOOLS		SCH IN DIST W/ 1-6 ELEM SCH		SCH IN DIST W/ 7-11 ELEM SCH	
	INTERMEDI-ATE SCHOOLS		SCH IN DIST W/ 1-6 ELEM SCH		SCH IN DIST W/ 7-11 ELEM SCH		SCH IN DIST W/ 12-20 ELEM SCH		SCH IN DIST W/ > 20 ELEM SCH		FULL TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	PART TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	FULL TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	PART TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	FULL TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	PART TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR
	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN
SCHOOL RESPONSE RE: # OF TEACHERS																
RESPONDENT	8	17.8	28	20.7	18	34.6	7	11.5	8	15.7	3.9	0.5	4.2	0.4	4.0	0.2
NONRESPONDENT	37	82.2	107	79.3	34	65.4	54	88.5	43	84.3	4.4	0.3	4.1	0.4	3.9	0.3
TOTAL POPULATION	45	100.0	135	100.0	52	100.0	61	100.0	51	100.0	4.3	0.3	4.1	0.4	3.9	0.3

TABLE II.10: DIFFERENCES IN NUMBER OF TEACHERS PER 100 PUPILS BETWEEN RESPONDENT AND NONRESPONDENT PUBLIC SCHOOLS

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	PUBLIC SCHOOL STRATIFICATION			
	SCH IN DIST W/ 12-20 ELEM SCH		SCH IN DIST W/ > 20 ELEM SCH	
	FULL TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	PART TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	FULL TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	PART TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR
	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN
SCHOOL RESPONSE RE: # OF TEACHERS				
RESPONDENT	3.8	0.2	3.8	0.4
NONRESPONDENT	3.6	0.2	5.0	0.3
TOTAL POPULATION	3.7	0.2	4.8	0.3

TABLE II.10: DIFFERENCES IN NUMBER OF TEACHERS PER 100 PUPILS BETWEEN RESPONDENT AND NONRESPONDENT PUBLIC SCHOOLS

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	PUBLIC SCHOOL STRATIFICATION						PUBLIC SCHOOL STRATIFICATION					
	HIGH SCHOOLS		JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS		CONTINUATION / TECHNICAL SCHOOLS		HIGH SCHOOLS		JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS		CONTINUATION / TECHNICAL SCHOOLS	
							FULL TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	PART TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	FULL TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	PART TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	FULL TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	PART TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR
	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN
SCHOOL RESPONSE RE: # OF TEACHERS												
RESPONDENT	43	28.1	11	29.7	6	20.7	3.6	0.3	4.2	0.4	4.6	0.0
NONRESPONDENT	110	71.9	26	70.3	23	79.3	3.7	0.3	4.1	0.1	5.0	0.4
TOTAL POPULATION	153	100.0	37	100.0	29	100.0	3.7	0.3	4.1	0.2	4.9	0.3

TABLE II.11: DIFFERENCES IN NUMBER OF TEACHERS PER 100 PUPILS BETWEEN RESPONDENT AND NONRESPONDENT PRIVATE SCHOOLS

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	PRIVATE SCHOOL STRATIFICATION												PRIVATE SCHOOL STRATIFICATION			
	CATH PAR, ELEM		CATH PRIV, ELEM		OTHER RELIG, ELEM		OTHER RELIG, K-12, UNGR		NON-SECTARIAN, ELEM		NON-SECTARIAN, K-12, UNGR		CATH PAR, ELEM		CATH PRIV, ELEM	
													FULL TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	PART TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	FULL TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	PART TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR
	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM	N	% OF STRA-TUM	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN
SCHOOL RESPONSE RE: # OF TEACHERS																
RESPONDENT	69	46.0	1	16.7	15	24.2	4	25.0	15	26.8	6	31.6	2.9	0.7	4.3	0.0
NONRESPONDENT	81	54.0	5	83.3	47	75.8	12	75.0	41	73.2	13	68.4	3.0	0.7	6.7	2.4
TOTAL POPULATION	150	100.0	6	100.0	62	100.0	16	100.0	56	100.0	19	100.0	2.9	0.7	6.3	2.0

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	PRIVATE SCHOOL STRATIFICATION							
	OTHER RELIG, ELEM		OTHER RELIG, K-12, UNGR		NON-SECTARIAN, ELEM		NON-SECTARIAN, K-12, UNGR	
	FULL TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	PART TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	FULL TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	PART TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	FULL TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	PART TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	FULL TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	PART TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR
	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN
SCHOOL RESPONSE RE: # OF TEACHERS								
RESPONDENT	5.4	1.4	6.5	2.6	9.3	3.2	6.9	4.4
NONRESPONDENT	4.5	2.2	5.7	2.4	5.7	2.8	13.5	2.0
TOTAL POPULATION	4.7	2.0	5.9	2.4	6.7	2.9	11.4	2.7

TABLE II.11: DIFFERENCES IN NUMBER OF TEACHERS PER 100 PUPILS BETWEEN RESPONDENT AND NONRESPONDENT PRIVATE SCHOOLS

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	PRIVATE SCHOOL STRATIFICATION								PRIVATE SCHOOL STRATIFICATION							
	CATH PAR, SEC		CATH PRIV, SEC		OTHER RELIG, SEC		NON-SECTARIAN, SEC		CATH PAR, SEC		CATH PRIV, SEC		OTHER RELIG, SEC		NON-SECTARIAN, SEC	
									FULL TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	PART TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	FULL TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	PART TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	FULL TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	PART TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	FULL TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	PART TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR
	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN
SCHOOL RESPONSE RE: # OF TEACHERS																
RESPONDENT	5	38.5	5	21.7	2	25.0	9	52.9	3.8	1.3	5.4	1.1	5.2	2.1	8.5	2.1
NONRESPONDENT	8	61.5	18	78.3	6	75.0	8	47.1	3.9	0.9	5.5	1.7	6.1	2.4	10.0	4.2
TOTAL POPULATION	13	100.0	23	100.0	8	100.0	17	100.0	3.9	1.0	5.5	1.6	5.9	2.3	9.2	3.1

(d) PUPIL ETHNICITY: We did find a bias in the response rates according to racial and ethnic composition of students. Respondent schools, on average , enrolled 3 to 24% more white students. In most but not all cases, nonrespondent schools enrolled more blacks and Hispanics. Enrollments of other minority students did not differ as much between respondent and nonrespondent schools. Tables II.12 show these differences in public schools by school level. We did not look at differences in ethnic composition of pupils in private schools because very few private schools reported such information. We attempted to correct for this response bias by using a weighting scheme described in the next section on data sources.

TABLE II.12: DIFFERENCES IN RACIAL ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF PUPILS BETWEEN RESPONDENT AND NONRESPONDENT PUBLIC SCHOOLS

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		PUBLIC SCHOOL STRATIFICATION									
		INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS		SCH IN DIST W/ 1-6 ELEM SCH		SCH IN DIST W/ 7-11 ELEM SCH		SCH IN DIST W/ 12-20 ELEM SCH		SCH IN DIST W/ > 20 ELEM SCH	
		RESPONSE TO SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE				RESPONSE TO SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE				RESPONSE TO SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE	
		RESPONDENT	NONRESPONDENT	RESPONDENT	NONRESPONDENT	RESPONDENT	NONRESPONDENT	RESPONDENT	NONRESPONDENT	RESPONDENT	NONRESPONDENT
% WHITE ENROLLMENT	MEAN %	72.4	62.4	74.9	73.0	62.3	59.3	71.0	58.7	69.9	45.1
% BLACK ENROLLMENT	MEAN %	11.3	6.8	4.7	8.6	6.1	4.6	4.9	13.0	12.5	27.5
% HISPANIC ENROLLMENT	MEAN %	6.0	18.2	11.5	10.5	17.8	24.9	9.0	15.9	9.9	13.8
% OTHER MINORITY ENROLLMENT	MEAN %	10.4	12.7	8.9	7.9	13.8	11.2	15.0	12.4	7.6	13.6

TABLE II.12: DIFFERENCES IN RACIAL ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF PUPILS BETWEEN RESPONDENT AND NONRESPONDENT PUBLIC SCHOOLS

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		PUBLIC SCHOOL STRATIFICATION					
		HIGH SCHOOLS		JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS		CONTINUATION / TECHNICAL SCHOOLS	
		RESPONSE TO SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE				RESPONSE TO SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE	
		RESPONDENT	NONRESPONDENT	RESPONDENT	NONRESPONDENT	RESPONDENT	NONRESPONDENT
% WHITE ENROLLMENT	MEAN %	66.2	61.8	41.9	35.0	62.3	52.9
% BLACK ENROLLMENT	MEAN %	7.8	13.9	24.5	29.8	20.0	19.5
% HISPANIC ENROLLMENT	MEAN %	12.5	14.0	12.6	15.0	15.9	20.6
% OTHER MINORITY ENROLLMENT	MEAN %	13.5	10.3	20.9	20.2	1.8	7.1

(e) CENTRAL CITY vs SUBURBAN: Tables II.13 show the percentages of respondents within each category which were in central city or suburban areas. There were greater relative proportions of private school respondents in central city than there were public schools respondents. Our response rates among large central city districts was relatively poor, as indicated by response rates in districts with greater than 20 elementary schools.

TABLE II.13 RETURN RATES FOR CENTRAL CITY VERSUS SUBURBAN SCHOOLS

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
		PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
		N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM
CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL BY LOCATION	RESPONSE TO SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE										
SUBURBAN SCHOOL	RESPONDENT	60	87.0	44	63.8	0	0	14	73.7	12	57.1
CENTRAL CITY SCHOOL	RESPONDENT	9	13.0	25	36.2	1	100.0	5	26.3	9	42.9
CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL BY LOCATION											
SUBURBAN SCHOOL	TOTAL	60	87.0	44	63.8	0	0	14	73.7	12	57.1
CENTRAL CITY SCHOOL	TOTAL	9	13.0	25	36.2	1	100.0	5	26.3	9	42.9
	RESPONSE TO SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE										
TOTAL	RESPONDENT	69	100.0	69	100.0	1	100.0	19	100.0	21	100.0
TOTAL	TOTAL	69	100.0	69	100.0	1	100.0	19	100.0	21	100.0

TABLE II.13 RETURN RATES FOR CENTRAL CITY VERSUS SUBURBAN SCHOOLS

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
		PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
		N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM
CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL BY LOCATION	RESPONSE TO SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE										
SUBURBAN SCHOOL	RESPONDENT	40	66.7	1	20.0	3	60.0	2	100.0	5	55.6
CENTRAL CITY SCHOOL	RESPONDENT	20	33.3	4	80.0	2	40.0	0	0	4	44.4
CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL BY LOCATION											
SUBURBAN SCHOOL	TOTAL	40	66.7	1	20.0	3	60.0	2	100.0	5	55.6
CENTRAL CITY SCHOOL	TOTAL	20	33.3	4	80.0	2	40.0	0	0	4	44.4
	RESPONSE TO SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE										
TOTAL	RESPONDENT	60	100.0	5	100.0	5	100.0	2	100.0	9	100.0
TOTAL	TOTAL	60	100.0	5	100.0	5	100.0	2	100.0	9	100.0

D. Data Sources.

The data for this study were derived from four major sources: 1) the California State Department of Education; 2) the central offices of the local Catholic Dioceses; 3) the IFG questionnaires; and 4) other miscellaneous governmental sources. The California State Department of Education gathers extensive information on the operations and resources of public schools on a regular basis. The Department also gathers some limited data on all private schools operating in the state. Each of the three Catholic Dioceses included in the sample counties provided IFG with a substantial amount of data gathered from all of the Catholic schools, excluding a few Catholic independent schools within their respective jurisdictions.

The IFG initiated a survey of the public and private schools in the six county San Francisco Bay Area. Eight different questionnaires were developed and sent out to selected public and private schools, principals, and teachers, and the public school districts. These questionnaires should be viewed as part of a larger data collection effort. In some cases, the questionnaires were used to gather data which were unavailable from other sources. In other instances, they served to enhance and clarify information available from existing sources.

Other data on demographic and economic characteristics of counties and cities in which the schools are located were gathered from sources such as the Census Bureau.

Four data bases were obtained from the sources mentioned above: the California Basic Education Data System (CBEDS), the Private School Affidavit. Catholic Diocese Data and the IFG Questionnaire Data. These data bases will now be discussed to illustrate the types of data available from each file.

(1) THE CALIFORNIA BASIC EDUCATION DATA SYSTEM (CBEDS).

CBEDS contains data exclusively on the public school sector. It contains data at three levels: the district, school and individual school personnel. All public school districts, schools, and certified personnel in the state are included on these files.

The district level data file contains data on three categories of classified staff, noncertified personnel such as paraprofessionals, and clerical workers. These are categorized according to full-time/part-time status and race, ethnicity, and sex. The ethnicity and enrollments of vocational education students in eleven categories of adult education programs are also included.

The school level file reports categories of classified staff similar to those at the district level. In addition, it contains student enrollment data by grade level, race, ethnicity, and sex and reports the number of high school graduates. The data base contains information on the number of students receiving free milk, free meals, and reduced-price meals.

The individual data are derived from the Professional Assignment Information Form which is administered to all certified staff within the state. Thus, it contains information on all professional public school personnel within our six county sample. The following information on professional personnel is available from the forms:

- the school, district, and county in which the individual is employed (This allows us to match school, district and county data to the individual);
- highest education level, ethnic background, sex, age, and years of service (total and within the district);
- various school assignments such as courses, classes, and administrative responsibilities; percent of time in each assignment;
- the numbers and types of students enrolled in such categories as limited/non-English speaking, handicapped, or educationally disadvantaged;
- types of certification , salary contract, and job appointment.

The CBEDS data provide substantial information about employment and compensation of public school personnel. Data on staffing patterns developed from the CBEDS were used by the Meyer/Scott and Chambers studies. The individual data on school personnel helped us to verify certain portions of the public school teacher and principal questionnaire data.

(2) PRIVATE SCHOOL AFFIDAVIT.

This data file is also provided by the California State Department of Education and contains data on all private schools within the state. It contains basic information identifying the school and data in the following areas:

- ownership of the school;
- types of students served;
- boarding or day school status;
- church or religious affiliation;
- grade levels offered;
- whether a high school diploma is offered;
- public school district in which it is located;
- tax exemption/non-profit status of the school;
- student enrollment by grade level;
- number of high school graduates;
- number of full- and part-time teachers and administrators.

The private school affidavit file provides independent verification of the structure of ownership and management identified from the responses to the IFG questionnaires.

(3) CATHOLIC DIOCESE DATA.

The three Catholic dioceses (San Francisco, San Jose and Oakland) in the six counties provided the IFG with access to their rather substantial data files. These files were in hard copy form. Copies of their own school level questionnaires were made for the IFG and entered into computer data files for our analysis. The San Francisco and San Jose Dioceses provided us with identical school survey forms: Oakland provided us with two slightly different forms (one for elementary and one for secondary). While there were some differences in the forms, the data items gathered by the three dioceses were fairly comparable for many categories of items. It was somewhat difficult (and tedious) to construct comparable measures or statistics for these schools. Less than 10% of the Catholic schools in our sample did not provide these forms to the Catholic Dioceses.

The following list illustrates the kinds of data included on these forms:

- School characteristics: grade level; ownership; affiliation with church or religious community; public school district in which it is located; certification of both school and principal; revenue and expense statements;

- Student characteristics: enrollment by grade level and sex; descriptive data on alumni college and professional choices;

- Personnel characteristics: total professional staff categorized by sex, full- or part-time, and lay or religious; level of education and previous experience (overall and broken down by lay and religious); quantities of different types of staff; salary ranges.

The Oakland Diocese provides some additional data on location of families in the parish, tuition levels, pupil ethnicity, and limited data on principals and individual teachers.

These data provided a wide range of information for the Meyer/Scott and Chambers studies on staffing and administrative configurations and employment and compensation patterns. The Encarnation/Richards studies utilized data on staffing, school location, and participation in government programs. The Catholic Diocese data will serve to backup and, more importantly, verify some of the patterns of variation observed in the school and personnel questionnaires. Given the broad range of ownership and management structures observed in the Catholic sector, the Catholic Dioceses data bases in conjunction with CBEDS are a rich source of information for comparative analysis.

(4) THE IFG SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRES

Eight questionnaires were developed by the members of the research team at the IFG for this study:

(1) PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT QUESTIONNAIRE;
(2) PUBLIC SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE;
(3) CATHOLIC SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE;
(4) PRIVATE SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE;
(5) SURVEY OF PRIVATE SCHOOL PRINCIPALS OR HEADS;
(6) SURVEY OF PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALS;
(7) SURVEY OF PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS;
(8) SURVEY OF PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS;

Copies of these questionnaires and the corresponding cover letters are found in Appendix A of this report.

The first four questionnaires were designed to gather school or district level data in eight basic areas: 1) background and identification of the school; 2) student enrollments; 3) staffing patterns and staff compensation; 4) student admissions; 5) educational philosophy, programs, and policies; 6) school governance and environment; 7) participation in government programs; and 8) school finance and budgets.

There are slight differences in these four institutional questionnaires. The public school and district questionnaires are significantly shorter in length than the private or Catholic school questionnaires because we were able to obtain substantial amounts of information on individual schools and school districts from CBEDS. Similarly, the three Catholic Dioceses in the San Francisco Bay Area provided hard copy data which substituted for much of the information we requested from non-Catholic private schools. Thus, we were able to shorten the Catholic School Questionnaire.

The last four questionnaires were designed to gather information on the personal characteristics and working conditions of individual school personnel employed in public and private schools. Two categories of personnel were surveyed: teachers and principals or school heads. These questionnaires are divided into four basic parts: 1) educational preparation; 2) professional background and experience; 3) compensation and terms of employment; and 4) personal background.

Only minor differences exist among these four questionnaires primarily reflecting the differences in the roles of principals and teachers and the types of remuneration and compensation provided by the public and private sector. For example, the private sector offers many forms of job perquisites that are not offered in the public sector. Items such as housing expenses, meals, and tuition benefits for children are not uncommon in private schools, but are virtually nonexistent in the public sector. Similarly, certain private school employees belong to religious orders or communities and may have special salary arrangements for contributed services. We had to account for these various factors in constructing our personnel questionnaires.

The development of all of these questionnaires was accomplished with considerable input from individuals familiar with the public and private sectors. A formal advisory panel was established in cooperation with the California Association of Private School Organizations (CAPSO). This panel of CAPSO representatives reviewed our private school survey instruments, assisted us in adapting the questionnaires to fit the circumstances relevant to private schools, and reduced much of the ambiguity of individual questions.

E. Summary of the Data Bases Developed from this Study.

From the four data sources described above, we developed two basic files: a school file (public, private and Catholic), and a personnel file containing both principals and teachers in both sectors.

The data contained in these files were organized to be consistent with the questions asked on the respective survey questionnaires. Therefore, the personnel file has four major parts, as does its survey counterpart; the school file has eight major parts. Wherever possible, variables which were pertinent to both district and school files were carefully matched to allow for interesting comparisons. Variables from external data sources -- CBEDS, Private School Affidavit and Catholic Diocese Data -- were matched to the district, school and personnel files when appropriate.

Compiling a data file of this magnitude was challenging, to say the least. We experienced many successes and failures during the two year period. The next two sections will present a brief assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of our sample design and collected data, and describe the weighting system we developed for purposes of analysis.

(1) STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE SAMPLE DESIGN AND DATA FILES

The eight questionnaires were developed by a committee comprised of members from the IFG public/private school project. Those familiar with the committee process will understand why there are some inconsistencies in these questionnaires. These inconsistencies made it difficult to match certain variables perfectly. For instance, the same question was asked on two questionnaires, but there were five alternative answers on one questionnare and only four on the other instrument. We adjusted the responses in the final data base to ensure comparability for analysis.

Matching IFG questionnaire variables to data from external sources also presented some problems. We had difficulty with the hard copy files provided by the Catholic Dioceses. Data were gathered and organized in slightly different ways by each of the three Dioceses in the six county area covered by our sample. Often questions asked of one county were not asked of another county. Furthermore, Dioceses' questionnaires did not cover all of the information covered by the IFG surveys. We matched Catholic Dioceses variables and information from the CBEDS and Private School Affidavit to our survey variables whenever possible.

The sample design for the public and private schools has two basic flaws. To achieve certain objectives, such as a larger number of individual school districts, certain types of schools were either over- or under-represented. Second, response rates for the various strata differed. We devised the weighting scheme described below to counteract these two problems. One should exercise caution in generalizing from the population of Bay Area schools to extremely different school populations, particularly in rural settings.

We experienced more difficulties with our sample design for the personnel files, primarily because we could not sample individual teachers directly. Also we were forced to make several exclusions because comparisons were difficult. For example, K-12 schools were excluded from the private school teacher sample because there was no comparable category in the public sector. This presents a problem because a disproportionately large number of nonsectarian schools are in this category.

The low return rates for schools, teachers and principals poses a major problem in several categories within the school and personnel files. The fewest respondents are in the following categories: Catholic private elementary (1 school, 2 teachers, 0 principals) and other religious secondary (2 schools, 1 principal). While data for most school, principal and teacher categories are sufficient for statistical analysis, the number of respondents for these two categories is too small for any serious comparative analysis. We have included these categories in the tables because they are a part of the data set, but they are generally ignored in the descriptions of the school and personnel tables.

The greatest strengths of the data files are their comprehensiveness and magnitude. The school file contains about 700 variables for 263 public and private schools and the personnel file contains about 500 variables for about 1300 school personnel. The data in these files are, in many respects, more extensive than the data used in the studies of Abramowitz, Erickson, and Coleman discussed in the introduction. Some of the variables contained in our data set are not available in any other data bases of which we are aware. Organizational variables are an important component of our data set, and both elementary and secondary levels are addressed. The private sector is stratified into Catholic parochial and private, nonsectarian and other religious schools, making it possible to identify differences among these private schools types. We feel this additional information provided in our data base more than compensates for the few design flaws and respondent problems mentioned above.

(2) WEIGHTING SCHEME

When analyzing a random sample from a single homogeneous population, it is usually appropriate to weight observations equally in statistical calculations. With more complex sampling plans, however, it becomes necessary to weight observations differently to obtain unbiased estimates of population parameters.

There are two reasons why weights for the school and personnel files were developed. First, in selecting the original respondent samples, different proportions of schools were taken in different strata. For example, 78% of elementary schools in districts with 1 to 6 elementary schools were included in the sample. On the other hand, of the 73 junior high schools in the six county Bay Area, only 37 were randomly selected to receive school questionnaires. The second reason for weighting is to reduce nonresponse bias. Of the 937 public and nonpublic schools sampled, only 263 returned usable school questionnaires. As mentioned earlier, some types of schools responded at different rates than other types, potentially introducing systematic biases into the data. To reduce these biases, schools were post-stratified according to additional variables not used in defining the original sample strata, and respondent schools were weighted to make their distribution on these additional variables match the distribution for the entire sample as closely as possible. The technical aspects of this weighting scheme are described in Appendix B.

In presenting the variables in the school and personnel files, we elected to display unweighted data and tables for two basic reasons.

First, it was impossible to present the exact number of observations (N's) in tables using weighted data because the weighting scheme inflates the number of observations. We felt it would be more useful for the reader to know, in most cases, precisely how many schools, teachers, or principals responded to a particular question. Second, when there are only a few observations in a cell -- only 2 Catholic private elementary schools responded, for example -- the weighting system, which may change a 50% 'yes'/50% 'no' response to a 66% 'yes'/33% 'no' response can be misleading.

Weighting will be most useful, and most appropriate, in regression analyses or other calculations using all or most of the schools in the file, but not when reporting data for a few schools at a time, as in cross-tabulations. For such analyses, a close comparison of the data in weighted and unweighted files has shown few differences in the results. The highlights for the school and personnel files contained in the next section were consistent for both weighted and nonweighted data. In his study on compensation patterns of teachers, Chambers achieved virtually identical results with both weighted and unweighted data. This robustness of results to differential weighting of observations is encouraging. Large differences would suggest that regression models were not correctly specified.

Our purpose in describing the weighting scheme is to alert readers to the fact that both unweighted and weighted data are available to those who wish to conduct further research using the school and personnel files.

III. HIGHLIGHTS

The descriptions and tables of the variables in the school and personnel files are so extensive that we decided to highlight the more interesting findings in a separate section. Readers seeking an overview of the general results of the study should find this section sufficient for their needs. Those who need further information about various variables will find detailed descriptions of the school and personnel files in the next two sections.

Keep in mind that the results highlighted here are preliminary observations. Further analyses of the data are required to determine the statistical significance of these findings. Following each of the items highlighted is a designation in parentheses of the Tables in which more detailed information may be found.

A. School File

Student Characteristics

- Total enrollment in public elementary schools was close to twice that of private elementary schools. Overall, public secondary schools were 40% larger than private schools. Excluding Catholic parochial schools from the private sector, public secondary schools had four times the enrollment of their private school counterparts. (Tables IV.5)

- Catholic schools enrolled the highest percentages of minorities, viewed as a combined group, for both elementary and secondary levels. However, public schools enrolled slightly higher percentages of blacks at the secondary level; Catholic parochial and private schools enrolled a higher percentage of hispanics at both levels. (Tables IV.6)

- Catholic schools enrolled higher percentages of disadvantaged and welfare students than did the other religious and nonsectarian schools.

(Tables IV.7)

Staffing Patterns and Compensation

- Private schools, with the exception of Catholic parochial elementary, had greater numbers of teachers and administrators per 100 pupil enrollment than did the public schools. Nonsectarian secondary schools had a student-teacher ratio of about 9 to 1, compared to a student-teacher ratio of about 25 to 1 in the public and Catholic schools. Catholic parochial elementary schools had the highest student-teacher ratio: 28 to 1. (Tables IV.10-11)

- Part-time personnel were employed more frequently at the elementary level and in the private sector. (Tables IV.10-11)

- Nonsectarian and Catholic parochial schools showed slightly higher levels of volunteer service than the public schools. More volunteer hours were contributed for purposes of instruction and fundraising than for other activities in all school categories. (Tables IV.12)

- As expected, salaries for teachers and administrators in the public schools were, on average, higher than those offered in private schools. The highest teacher salary in a public elementary school was, on average, $11,500 to $12,500 more than the highest teacher salary in a private elementary school. (Tables IV.14)

- The vast majority of administrators (88% to 100%)in the public and private schools were white. More minorities, particularly Blacks, were employed in the public sector. The majority of administrators in each school category at the elementary level were female; the majority at the secondary level were male, except in Catholic parochial schools where 67% were female. (Tables IV.15)

- Similarly, most teachers (71% to 97%) employed in public and private schools were white. Catholic schools employed the largest percentage of minorities, particularly Hispanics. At the elementary level, 74% to 96% of the teachers were female. In contrast, 55% to 62% of teachers in secondary schools were male, with the exception of those in Catholic schools which were 80% female. (Tables IV.16)

- Formal employment negotiations were virtually nonexistent in private schools, with the exception of Catholic parochial secondary. There, 60%, or three schools reported some type of formal employment negotiations. One hundred percent of public elementary and 92% of public secondary used formal negotiations. (Tables IV.17)

- Public and Catholic school teachers had been teaching longer in their current schools: 65% to 80% had been teaching more than 5 years in their current schools. In contrast, 62% to 85% of teachers in nonsectarian and other religious schools had less than 5 years teaching experience in their current schools. (Tables IV.18)

- Virtually all teachers at all levels and in all types of schools had BA degrees. Catholic parochial and nonsectarian elementary schools reported small percentages of teachers without BA's -- 8% and 4% respectively. The percentage of teachers with masters degrees or higher were quite comparable between the public and private sectors: an average of about 25% at the elementary level; 45% at the secondary level. Nonsectarian secondary schools reported the highest percentage of teachers with a masters degree or higher -- close to 70%. (Tables IV. 19)

- Higher percentages of teachers were terminated for unsatisfactory performance in private schools. Higher percentages of teachers in the public sector were laid-off, granted leave, or retired. Six percent of public secondary teachers had been fired. (Tables IV.20)

Educational Philosophy

- The vast majority of private elementary and secondary schools required or considered student academic records, achievement or aptitude tests, and personnel recommendations for admission decisions. (Tables IV.21)

- Private schools placed more emphasis on 'critical thinking' as an important student outcome at both elementary and secondary levels than did public schools. Only 60% of public elementary and 40% of public secondary schools emphasized critical thinking, compared to 80% to 100% of the private schools in a given category. (Tables IV.22)

- Most schools in both the private and public sectors identified 'dedicated teachers' and 'student morale' as the two most important school features contributing to school success. At the elementary level, 'parental involvement' was cited as the third most important feature by most schools. 'Superior student discipline' and 'course offerings' were considered important by many of the secondary schools. 'Highly selected student body' was a critical success factor to nonsectarian and Catholic private schools. (Tables IV.23)

- Two school practices were deemed important by all schools at all levels: 'school-wide use of a particular curriculum' and 'systematic review of student progress'. Interestingly, elementary schools considered the use of a school-wide teaching method fairly important; secondary schools attributed no importance to this factor. One hundred percent of nonsectarian secondary schools and 80% of Catholic parochial schools cited the dismissal of poor students as a success factor. (Tables IV.24)

- Most schools in both sectors agreed that the most important teacher attributes considered for hiring selections were: philosophy of education, previous experience, BA degree, and state certification. Affirmative action considerations were more important at the secondary level. Personal lifestyle was a more important consideration among private schools, particularly Catholic and other religious schools. (Tables IV.25)

School Governance

- Secondary schools, viewed as a group, averaged 19 school board members; elementary schools averaged 10 members. (Tables IV.28)

- Principals and school boards in both public and private schools had the most influence on curriculum, personnel, student admissions and budget decisions. Faculty influenced curriculum decisions, and to a lesser extent, teacher hiring and student admissions decisions. Parents had little role in decision-making in any of these areas. (Tables IV.29)

- Both public and private school principals were viewed as serving dual functions as instructional leaders *and* administrative managers. (Tables IV.30)

Government Programs

- PUBLIC PROGRAMS: Private elementary schools (excluding nonsectarian) participated somewhat in the onsite health and welfare services. An average of 60 students in Catholic parochial schools were enrolled in public school classes. (Tables IV.34)

- FEDERAL AND STATE PROGRAMS: Nonsectarian schools participated to a small extent in the federal child nutrition and the school library materials programs. Catholic schools participated in the federal compensatory education, bilingual, and special education programs. Private school participation in programs for the disabled was minimal. (Tables IV.35-36)

School Finances and Budgets

- Nonsectarian schools were about two to four times more expensive than other private schools. Tuition in Catholic elementary schools was $600 to $700 a year, compared to $2000 to $2600 in nonsectarian elementary schools. Although, and perhaps because they are more expensive, nonsectarian schools provided a higher percentage of their students with partial or full scholarships: 20% compared to 10%-15% in other private school types (excluding the one Catholic private elementary school respondent). (Tables IV.39-40)

- About 90% of total revenue of nonsectarian elementary and 80% of total revenue in nonsectarian secondary schools came from tuition and fees. Tuition and fees comprised about 80% of the total revenues of other religious elementary and secondary schools. (Tables IV.41)

B. Personnel File

Educational Preparation

- Secondary school teachers and principals in both public and private sectors were more likely to have earned a masters degree than elementary school teachers and principals. Between 14% and 35% of elementary teachers held masters degrees, compared to 40% to 60% of secondary teachers. (Tables V.1A-B)

- Public and nonsectarian school teachers revealed higher percentages with masters degrees than did teachers in the Catholic and other religious sectors. Nonsectarian schools had a slightly higher percentage of personnel with doctorates than any other category. (Tables V.1A-B)

- Higher percentages of principals, in both the public and private sectors, received higher degrees than teachers. The majority of principals at both levels held a masters or higher degree. The percentages of principals holding doctorates was still quite low -- from 0% in the other religious category to 40% in nonsectarian elementary schools. (Tables V.1A-B)

- Greater percentages of public school teachers (67%) had completed 61 or more semester hours of college work beyond the bachelors degree. (Table V.2A-B)

- Large proportions of personnel in all school categories except other religious secondary held permanent California teaching certificates. Public and Catholic schools had the highest percentages of personnel with in-state teaching certificates. (Tables V.4A-B)

- Higher percentages of teachers and principals in nonsectarian and other religious schools attended colleges and universities out of state than did those in public or Catholic schools. (Tables V.5A-B)

- Relatively low percentages (less than 38%) of teachers and principals attended community colleges for one or more years. (Tables V.6A-B)

- Low percentages of teachers and principals in both public and private sectors reported science as a major in either undergraduate or graduate school. However, more personnel at the secondary level reported majoring in a science or math field. Much more common majors among the respondents were social sciences, humanities and, particularly at the elementary level, education. Higher percentages of personnel held advanced degrees in education, particularly principals, the majority of whom held advanced degrees in education. (Tables V.7A-B)

- High percentages of personnel in all sectors (50% to 100%) stated that their undergraduate grade point average (GPA) was in the B to B+ range, or 2.6 to 3.5 range. A smaller, but still substantial percentage of teachers and principals had GPA's above 3.5. A slightly higher percentage of nonsectarian school teachers, 33%, reported a GPA of 3.6 or above, compared to 22% of teachers in the public sector. (Tables V.8A-B)

Background Information

- In general, public school teachers are slightly older than teachers in the other sectors, averaging 44 years of age compared to 28 to 40 years in the private sector. There is little age difference between elementary and secondary school teachers except for teachers in the other religious and Catholic private school categories. Principals were older than teachers in their respective school categories. (Table 9A-B)

- Between 75% and 100% of the teachers in the elementary school categories were female. This percentage decreases at the secondary level, where 40% to 66% of the teachers were female. Only in Catholic private secondary schools were a majority of the teachers female. (Tables V.10a-B)

- Although 79% of elementary public school teachers were female, 72% of the principals were male. In contrast, 90% of Catholic parochial and 67% of nonsectarian elementary school principals were female. These percentages shifted at the secondary level, where 44% of Catholic parochial and 90% of nonsectarian school principals were male. Other religious school principals were predominantly male. (Tables V.10A-B)

- The overwhelming majority of teachers and principals in both public and private sectors were caucasian. The lowest percentage of white teachers was 84% in the Catholic parochial elementary schools. The minority groups with the greatest representation were Hispanics (7%) in Catholic parochial elementary schools and blacks (13%) among public secondary school principals. (Tables V.11A-B)

- The parents of teachers and principals in most school categories had at least a high school education. Principals' parents had, on average, fewer years of schooling that did teachers' parents. There were few differences between levels of education of mothers and fathers.

(Tables V. 14A-B)

- More parents of teachers and principals were employed as professionals, technicians, managers or administrators. For most school categories, the largest percentages of mothers were classified as housepersons. (Tables V.15A-B)

- Close to 100% of teachers and principals in all schools stated that their health did not limit their work. (Tables V.16-17)

Attitudes Toward the Profession

- The most popular reasons for becoming an educator, in order of preference, for the majority of teachers and principals were: 1) general commitment to working with children, and 2) employment conditions (hours, location, etc.) A high percentage of Catholic and other religious school teachers cited a commitment to religious values as an important reason for becoming an educator. Only between 1% and 22% of teachers and principals in any school category cited salary and fringe benefits as an important reason for choosing education, and more personnel in the public sector chose this reason. (Tables V.18A-B)

- The majority of personnel in both elementary and secondary schools stated that they would either remain in education until normal retirement age, or they were undecided. Only 1% to 12% said they would leave education as soon as possible. (Tables V.19A-B)

- The vast majority of teachers and principals stated they were committed to their present schools. (Tables V.20A-B)

- Higher percentages of personnel in the private sector (60% to 100%) said they certainly or probably would become educators again if given the choice. Only 44% to 48% of public school teachers and elementary school principals similarly responded. Seventy percent of public secondary principals said they would become educators again.

(Tables V.21A-B)

- If given a choice for next year, the majority of teachers and principals would choose their current position. A slightly higher percentage of public school teachers stated they would choose a different position -- about 35% compared to 15% to 30% among private schools. Principals expressed an even greater degree of satisfaction with their current positions. (Tables V.22A-B)

Employment Information

- School personnel rarely spend more than 1 or 2 years as a teacher or administrator in a sector different from their present one. In most school categories, they averaged only 1 to 3 years working in employment outside the field of education. (Tables V.23A-B)

- Both elementary and secondary public school teachers averaged more years of teaching experience than teachers in the private sector. Public school teachers had a mean of approximately 15 years teaching experience, compared to between 2 and 10 years in the other school categories. (Tables V.24A-B)

- Similarly, public school teachers and principals had been employed in their present schools for more years than personnel in the other sectors. Fifty-five percent of public school teachers had been employed in their present schools at least 11 years. In contrast, the majority of teachers in the private sector had been employed in their present schools for 0 to 5 years. (Tables V.25A-B)

- Most of the primary job assignments for elementary teachers were in self-contained classrooms; the majority of secondary school teachers stated both their primary and secondary assignments were departmentalized. More teachers in the public sector had primary job assignments in vocational and special education and student services.

Slightly higher percentages of private school teachers reported secondary job assignment. (Tables V.28A-B)

- Although the absolute levels for both sectors were low, private elementary school teachers spent more of their time teaching subjects for which they were not formally trained than did their public school peers. There was no such distinction between public and private at the secondary level. (Tables V.29A-B)

Terms and Conditions of Employment

- Teachers averaged between 178 and 224 days of work a year. Other religious elementary school teachers worked 224 days a year, more days than teachers worked in the other elementary school categories. Public secondary school teachers worked approximately 184 days a year, considerably less than other religious secondary teachers who worked 220 days a year. Principals average 200 to 270 work days a year. Nonsectarian secondary principals had the longest work year -- 270 days. (Tables V. 30A-B)

- Nonsectarian secondary school teachers had the smallest average class size, approximately 15 students. Catholic parochial and private schools had the largest classes, 33 and 34 students respectively. Catholic parochial elementary school teachers taught the largest number of students on an average day, 65; nonsectarian elementary school teachers had the fewest students, only 36. In general, secondary school teachers taught more students a day. (Tables V.32-33)

- Higher percentages of public school teachers reported student discipline problems, in particular, disregard for school rules and poor attendance. Over 70% of the private secondary school teachers reported no serious discipline problems in their schools, but only 29% of public secondary school teachers said this was true of their schools. It is notable that teachers perceived more discipline problems than principals in the same school category. (Tables V.34A-B)

- More public school teachers reported having difficulty obtaining instructional supplies than did private school teachers. (Tables V.35)

- The majority of private school teachers reported that they did not belong to any teacher organizations. About 90% of public elementary and secondary school teachers said they belonged to the California Teachers Association (CTA). (Tables V.37)

Compensation

- Public school teachers, in general, received higher compensation than private school teachers. About 78% of public school teachers received an annual salary of $24,000 or more, whereas 25% or less of private school teachers in the various strata reported similar compensation. Ninety-seven percent of public school principals received a salary of $30,000 or more. In contrast, 60% of nonsectarian principals received a similar salary and the percentages of principals in the $30,000 or above range were even lower for the other private school categories. (Tables V.38A-B)

- In general, public school personnel received more fringe benefits than did those in private school. The most common types of fringe benefits were general medical and dental. Percentages of personnel receiving full medical and dental coverage were greater in the public sector. Benefits for principals were in most instances greater than those for teachers. (Tables V.39A-B)

- Job perquisites were fairly common for private school personnel, particularly perks such as free meals, free tuition for children, college tuition for self, convention and travel expenses, and housing. Catholic parochial and private schools received the most job perquisites. Secondary school personnel reported receiving a greater variety of and slightly more job perquisites than did elementary personnel. (Tables V.40A-B)

IV. DESCRIPTION OF THE SCHOOL FILE

A. INTRODUCTION

Many of us have fairly fixed impressions of differences between public and private schools. We think of public schools as larger, more bureaucratic, serving a more diverse population of students, and paying higher salaries to teachers who are generally more experienced. We picture private schools as small communities with low student-faculty ratios, catering primarily to white students. Many people think private schools are truly independent and do not participate in any publicly funded programs.

The data from schools which responded to our questionnaires tend to confirm some of these preconceptions and upset others. Student enrollment in public schools was, on average, about twice that of private schools. Average student-teacher ratios in nonsectarian and other religious private schools were considerably lower than those in public schools. Teachers and administrators in public schools generally had more years of teaching experience and received higher compensation.

Catholic schools in our sample, however, enrolled the highest percentages of minority and disadvantaged students. Private schools had more on site administrators per 100 pupil enrollment than did their public school counterparts. Private schools participated to a small degree in a variety of government programs, including compensatory education, child nutrition and school library materials programs. Furthermore, there is often as much diversity within the private sector itself as there is between public and private schools.

The comprehensiveness of the school data set described in Section II allows us to make such general comparisons between public and private schools along a variety of dimensions. The purpose of this chapter is to present in detail, through Tables and their descriptions, the components of the school data set. The material will be organized into seven broad areas corresponding closely to those contained in the IFG SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRES :

1) Basic school characteristics
2) Student characteristics
3) Staffing patterns and staff compensation
4) School philosophy and practices
5) School governance and environment
6) Participation in government programs
7) School finance and budgets

School district data will not be discussed seperately. Information from district questionnaires and CBEDS district data pertinent to the eight areas listed above has been utilized when appropriate.

Readers should be reminded that several categories of schools had very few respondents: Catholic private elementary (1 respondent); other religious secondary (2 respondents). Discussions of these two groups is very limited in the text describing the tables, and the two groups have been combined with other categories as much as possible. Interpretations of data for these categories and others with few respondents should be made with caution.

B.Basic School Characteristics

1. Sex of students served by the school

As one would expect, *all* public school respondents were coeducational. In addition, all of the private elementary schoools were coeducational, with the exception of one nonsectarian school which served females only. At the secondary level, there was more variation among responding schools. One Catholic private school served females only; one nonsectarian school served females only. Tables IV.1 show the sex of students served by the elementary and secondary schools.

TABLE IV.1: SEX OF STUDENTS SERVED BY THE SCHOOL

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE										TOTAL	
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN			
	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM
SEX OF STUDENTS SERVED IN SCHOOL												
ALL MALE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.8	1	0.6
ALL FEMALE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.8	1	0.6
COEDUCATIONAL	68	100.0	67	100.0	1	100.0	19	100.0	19	90.5	174	98.9
TOTAL	68	100.0	67	100.0	1	100.0	19	100.0	21	100.0	176	100.0

TABLE IV.1: SEX OF STUDENTS SERVED BY THE SCHOOL

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE										TOTAL	
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN			
	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM
SEX OF STUDENTS SERVED IN SCHOOL												
ALL FEMALE	0	0	0	0	1	50.0	0	0	1	11.1	2	2.8
COEDUCATIONAL	57	100.0	1	100.0	1	50.0	2	100.0	8	88.9	69	97.2
TOTAL	57	100.0	1	100.0	2	100.0	2	100.0	9	100.0	71	100.0

2. Day School versus Boarding School

All schools that responded were day schools except nonsectarian secondary schools. In this groups, 22%, or 2 schools were a combination of day and boarding.

3. School's Religious Affiliation

It goes without saying that the public schools have no religious affiliation and the Catholic parochial and private are all affiliated with the Roman Catholic Church. Other religious schools had a variety of religious affiliations, particularly at the elementary level where more schools responded. Schools at that level were affiliated with the Baptist, Calvinist, Episcopal, Lutheran, Seventh Day Adventist churches and several others not specifically mentioned.

It is interesting to note, and difficult to explain, that one nonsectarian school at both the elementary and secondary levels had a religious affiliation. The percentages for each school category are contained in Tables IV.2.

TABLE IV.2: SCHOOL'S RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE										TOTAL	
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN			
	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM
RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION												
NO RELIG AFFIL	69	100.0	0	0	0	0	2	10.5	20	95.2	91	50.8
BAPTIST	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.3	0	0	1	0.6
CALVINIST	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.3	0	0	1	0.6
EPISCOPAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	15.8	0	0	3	1.7
LUTHERAN	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	31.6	0	0	6	3.4
ROMAN CATHOLIC	0	0	69	100.0	1	100.0	0	0	0	0	70	39.1
SEVENTH DAY ADVENTIST	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	15.8	0	0	3	1.7
OTHER RELIGIOUS	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	15.8	1	4.8	4	2.2
TOTAL	69	100.0	69	100.0	1	100.0	19	100.0	21	100.0	179	100.0

TABLE IV.2: SCHOOL'S RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE										TOTAL	
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN			
	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM
RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION												
NO RELIG AFFIL	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	88.9	68	84.0
ROMAN CATHOLIC	0	0	5	100.0	5	100.0	0	0	0	0	10	12.3
SEVENTH DAY ADVENTIST	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50.0	0	0	1	1.2
OTHER RELIGIOUS	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50.0	1	11.1	2	2.5
TOTAL	60	100.0	5	100.0	5	100.0	2	100.0	9	100.0	81	100.0

4. Organizational Structure of the School

Administrators of private schools in our sample were asked to describe the type of ownership and control that best characterized their schools. They were presented with several options : a) Parochial, church affiliated; b) diocesan owned, parish controlled; c) diocesan owned, diocesan controlled; d) religious teaching order; and several others (see IFG QUESTIONNAIRES in Appendix A for a complete list). There was such variety in the responses, particularly among Catholic schools, that we decided to reduce the number of categories of organizational structure to those shown in Tables IV.3. These categories capture the majority of respondents and have the following meanings:

• Parochial School	owned and/or operated by the church parish;
• Diocesan School	owned and/or operated at diocese level;
• Catholic Private	independent of the diocese; controlled by a religious order;
• Owned by Central Religious Association	owned by central/regional religious assoc.;
• Other non-profit	independently controlled; non-profit;
• Proprietary	independently controlled; for profit.

It should be noted that both Catholic parochial and diocesan schools are owned by dioceses, but are operated at different levels: Catholic parochial at the church parish level, and diocesan at the diocese level.

A hundred percent of Catholic parochial and 63% of other religious elementary schools were owned or operated by the church parish. Eighty percent of the Catholic parochial secondary schools were owned or operated at the diocese level. *All* of the proprietary schools in our sample were at the elementary level; 14% of nonsectarian elementary and 5% of other religious elementary schools, or a total of four schools, were operated for profit. These schools may represent ones which enroll students in pre-kindergarten through the first few grades and are more commonly run for profit.

TABLE IV.3: ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE SCHOOL

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE											
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN		TOTAL	
	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM
ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF SCHOOL												
PUBLIC SCHOOL	69	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	38.5
PAROCHIAL SCHOOL	0	0	69	100.0	0	0	12	63.2	0	0	81	45.3
CATHOLIC PRIVATE SCHOOL	0	0	0	0	1	100.0	0	0	0	0	1	0.6
OWNED BY CENTRAL RELIG ASSOC	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.3	0	0	1	0.6
OTHER NON-PROFIT	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	15.8	16	76.2	19	10.6
PROPRIETARY	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.3	3	14.3	4	2.2
OTHER ORGANIZATIONAL FORM	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10.5	2	9.5	4	2.2
TOTAL	69	100.0	69	100.0	1	100.0	19	100.0	21	100.0	179	100.0

TABLE IV.3: ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE SCHOOL

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE										TOTAL	
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN			
	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM
ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF SCHOOL												
PUBLIC SCHOOL	60	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	74.1
PAROCHIAL SCHOOL	0	0	1	20.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.2
DIOCESAN HIGH SCHOOL	0	0	4	80.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4.9
CATHOLIC PRIVATE SCHOOL	0	0	0	0	5	100.0	0	0	0	0	5	6.2
OWNED BY CENTRAL RELIG ASSOC	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50.0	0	0	1	1.2
OTHER NON-PROFIT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	100.0	9	11.1
OTHER ORGANIZATIONAL FORM	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50.0	0	0	1	1.2
TOTAL	60	100.0	5	100.0	5	100.0	2	100.0	9	100.0	81	100.0

5. Year the School was Established

Tables IV.4 display the approximate year in which each private school in our sample was established. Small response rates for Catholic schools made it difficult to form conclusions about these schools. About 60% of nonsectarian elementary and 40% of nonsectarian secondary schools were established in the last 25 years. The majority of other religious elementary schools were also established more recently, 68% since 1950.

TABLE IV.4: YEAR THE SCHOOL WAS ESTABLISHED

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE								TOTAL	
	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN			
	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM
YEAR SCHOOL ESTABLISHED										
1975 TO PRESENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	19.0	4	9.3
1970 - 1974	0	0	0	0	4	21.1	4	19.0	8	18.6
1965 - 1969	0	0	0	0	1	5.3	3	14.3	4	9.3
1960 - 1964	1	50.0	0	0	3	15.8	2	9.5	6	14.0
1950 - 1959	0	0	0	0	5	26.3	3	14.3	8	18.6
1930 - 1949	0	0	0	0	2	10.5	2	9.5	4	9.3
1900 - 1929	0	0	0	0	2	10.5	3	14.3	5	11.6
BEFORE 1900	1	50.0	1	100.0	2	10.5	0	0	4	9.3
TOTAL	2	100.0	1	100.0	19	100.0	21	100.0	43	100.0

TABLE IV.4: YEAR THE SCHOOL WAS ESTABLISHED

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE								TOTAL	
	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN			
	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM
YEAR SCHOOL ESTABLISHED										
1975 TO PRESENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	11.1	1	7.7
1970 - 1974	0	0	0	0	1	50.0	0	0	1	7.7
1965 - 1969	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	11.1	1	7.7
1960 - 1964	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	11.1	1	7.7
1950 - 1959	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	11.1	1	7.7
1900 - 1929	1	100.0	0	0	1	50.0	4	44.4	6	46.2
BEFORE 1900	0	0	1	100.0	0	0	1	11.1	2	15.4
TOTAL	1	100.0	1	100.0	2	100.0	9	100.0	13	100.0

C. STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

1. Total Enrollment

Total student enrollment in public schools is, on average, greater than the total enrollment in any type of private school at both the elementary and secondary levels (see Tables IV.5). Public schools at the elementary level were about twice the size of their private school counterparts, taken as a group. Average student enrollment in public elementary schools was 417; in Catholic parochial elementary schools, it was 300; and in nonsectarian and other religious schools, enrollments were about 200.

At the secondary level, public schools are, on average, 60% larger than the private schools taken as a group. Their enrollments average 1270 students. When Catholic parochial schools, which have an average enrollment of 835, are excluded, enrollment discrepencies are even greater. For example, the enrollment in public secondary schools is about four times greater than that in nonsectarian secondary schools and seven times greater than the average enrollment in other religious secondary schools.

TABLE IV.5: TOTAL ENROLLMENT

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL
TOTAL SCH ENROLLMENT	MEAN	416.7	300.0	188.0	198.2	214.9	323.6

TABLE IV.5: TOTAL ENROLLMENT

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL
TOTAL SCH ENROLLMENT	MEAN	1270.2	834.8	521.6	166.0	273.2	1059.1

2.Racial and Ethnic Composition of Schools

Tables IV.6 below show the mean percentages of white, black, hispanic and other minority enrollments for all schools at both elementary and seconddry levels. The category 'Other Minority' includes American Indian, Asian Pacific, Pacific Islander, and Philippino. There were several interesting results.

At the elementary level, the public schools enrolled the highest percentage of white students (70%) and the lowest percentage of black students (7%). Other religious schools enrolled a remarkably high percentage of black students -- 26%. This could be attributed to the number of Baptist and Seventh Day Adventist school respondents in this category. Note also the high percentages of hispanics enrolled in Catholic parochial elementary schools (18%) and the Catholic private elementary school respondent (56%). The Catholic schools enrolled the highest percentage of minority students at both elementary and secondary levels -- close to 50%.

The results are somewhat different for schools at the secondary level. Here, nonsectarian and other religious schools enrolled the largest percentages of white students, 80% and 70% respectively. Note the low percentages of blacks (5%) and hispanics (3%) enrolled in nonsectarian secondary schools. Fifty-eight percent of public school enrollees were white; 54% of Catholic parochial and 49% of Catholic private school students were white. Again, Catholic parochial and private schools enrolled higher percentages of minority students, in particular hispanics and those classified as 'other'. Interestingly, public schools enrolled higher percentages of black students at the secondary level than they did at the elementary level.

Keep in mind that these results are presented in percent of enrollment, not in actual number of students. One would assume, given the greater enrollment in public schools, that even in instances where the percent of enrollment is less, that public schools would enroll greater numbers of minority students.

TABLE IV.6: RACIAL AND ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF SCHOOLS

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					TOTAL RETURNS
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	
% WHITE ENROLLMENT	MEAN %	70.3	50.9	27.6	61.0	73.7	61.9
% BLACK ENROLLMENT	MEAN %	6.7	19.3	12.1	27.1	11.6	14.3
% HISPANIC ENROLLMENT	MEAN %	12.2	18.4	55.7	6.3	5.8	13.6
% OTHER MINORITY ENROLLMENT	MEAN %	10.8	11.4	4.6	5.6	9.0	10.3

TABLE IV.6: RACIAL AND ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF SCHOOLS

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					TOTAL RETURNS
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	
% WHITE ENROLLMENT	MEAN %	61.2	54.7	48.9	70.0	79.8	62.3
% BLACK ENROLLMENT	MEAN %	12.1	16.0	9.9	9.9	4.6	11.3
% HISPANIC ENROLLMENT	MEAN %	12.8	16.8	18.9	11.0	3.2	12.3
% OTHER MINORITY ENROLLMENT	MEAN %	13.9	12.4	22.3	9.1	12.3	14.1

3. Enrollment of Disabled and Disadvantaged Students

We experienced difficulty matching data on this variable in the CBEDS file with the questionnaires. Therefore, we present to you in Tables IV.7 the information available about the enrollment of disabled and disadvantaged students in private schools only. AFDC enrollments consist of students whose parents are receiving aid for families with dependent children, or welfare.

Catholic parochial elementary and secondary schools enrolled more disadvantaged and welfare students than did nonsectarian or other religious schools. Such students in Catholic parochial schools made up 15% to 20% of the student body. More disadvantaged students were enrolled at the elementary level than secondary level in all four types of private schools.

The percent of disabled students enrolled in any of these types of private schools was quite small. The only blip on the screen was a 2% enrollment of disabled students in Catholic parochial secondary schools.

TABLE IV.7: COMPOSITION OF STUDENTS BY SPECIAL NEED CATEGORIES:
HANDICAPPED, DISADVANTAGED, AFDC

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
% HANDICAPPED ENROLLMENTS	MEAN %	0.4	0.0	0.4	0.6	0.4
% DISADVANTAGED ENROLLMENTS	MEAN %	14.3	40.0	3.3	1.2	10.0
% AFDC ENROLLMENTS	MEAN %	7.8	50.0	3.2	1.8	6.2

TABLE IV.7: COMPOSITION OF STUDENTS BY SPECIAL NEED CATEGORIES:
HANDICAPPED, DISADVANTAGED, AFDC

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
% HANDICAPPED ENROLLMENTS	MEAN %	2.2	0.2	0.5	0.1	0.7
% DISADVANTAGED ENROLLMENTS	MEAN %	10.4	1.3	0.5	0.1	3.1
% AFDC ENROLLMENTS	MEAN %	4.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	2.5

4. Distribution of students according to distance from school

Again, we have no data for this variable from the public schools. The majority of students enrolled in private schools, with the exception of other religious secondary school students, lived no more than 5 miles from the school (see Tables IV.8). This majority was more pronounced at the elementary level, where 55%-90% of students lived within 5 miles of the school.

Students appear to travel greater distances to attend secondary schools. The percent of students living within five miles of the four types of secondary schools ranged from 40% in other religious private to 62% in nonsectarian secondary schools. Forty-four percent of Catholic private secondary school students lived over 5 miles from the school.

It is interesting to note that nonsectarian schools at both elementary and secondary levels enrolled a slightly greater percentage of students (about 17%) who lived more than 10 miles from the school. Only 3%-14% of the students at the other private schools lived more than 10 miles away. Also, only the nonsectarian secondary schools in our sample enrolled students from out of state. On average, about 12% of the families of students enrolled in nonsectarian schools lived outside of California. This result is not surprising, as nonsectarain secondary schools had more boarding students than other school types.

TABLE IV.8: DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS ACCORDING TO DISTANCE FROM SCHOOL

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
% ENR LIVING < 2 MILES FROM SCH	MEAN %	47.0	20.0	27.1	21.1	38.1
% ENR LIVING 2-5 MILES FROM SCHOOL	MEAN %	32.0	70.0	37.2	34.2	33.8
% ENR LIVING 5-10 MILES FROM SCHOOL	MEAN %	14.9	0.0	26.7	33.9	20.6
% ENR LIVING > 10 MILES FROM SCHOOL	MEAN %	6.0	10.0	9.0	10.7	7.5

TABLE IV.8: DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS ACCORDING TO DISTANCE FROM SCHOOL

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
% ENR LIVING < 2 MILES FROM SCH	MEAN %	12.2	24.6	12.5	27.4	21.7
% ENR LIVING 2-5 MILES FROM SCHOOL	MEAN %	40.7	31.0	27.5	34.9	34.7
% ENR LIVING 5-10 MILES FROM SCHOOL	MEAN %	39.0	41.4	46.5	20.9	32.5
% ENR LIVING > 10 MILES FROM SCHOOL	MEAN %	8.0	3.0	13.5	16.8	11.1

5. Percentage of Catholic and Non-Catholic students

Tables IV.9 show the percentages of Catholic and non-Catholics attending Catholic schools. In elementary parochial schools, 80% of the students were Catholic. We did not receive information about these percentages from Catholic private elementary schools. At the secondary level, 72% of the students in Catholic parochial schools were Catholic; 78% of the students in Catholic private schools were Catholic.

TABLE IV.9: PERCENTAGE OF CATHOLIC AND NONCATHOLIC STUDENTS ATTENDING CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		PRIVATE SCHOOL STRATIFICATION		
		CATH PAR, ELEM	CATH PRIV, ELEM	TOTAL RETURNS
% ENR CATHOLIC	MEAN %	79.6	0	79.6
% ENR NON-CATHOLIC	MEAN %	20.4	0	20.4

TABLE IV.9: PERCENTAGE OF CATHOLIC AND NONCATHOLIC STUDENTS ATTENDING CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		PRIVATE SCHOOL STRATIFICATION		
		CATH PAR, SEC	CATH PRIV, SEC	TOTAL RETURNS
% ENR CATHOLIC	MEAN %	71.6	77.5	75.9
% ENR NON-CATHOLIC	MEAN %	28.4	22.5	24.1

D. STAFFING PATTERNS AND STAFF COMPENSATION

1. Staffing Patterns

We received information from both public and private schools on the distribution of their personnel into the following categories: instructional personnel (teachers and teachers' aides); professional support personnel (counselor's, librarians, nurses, chaplains, psychologists); administrators (principals and assistants, program administrators, business managers); support staff (clerical, custodial, bookkeeping). Tables IV.10 show the total number of different types of staff for each category of school at the elementary and secondary levels. Tables IV.11 show the total number of different types of staff per 100 pupils for each of these categories.

Several interesting results can be observed in these tables: 1) at least 50% of the staff in any type of school we studied consists of full- and part-time teachers; 2) staffs in elementary schools have a proportionately higher number of part-time personnel, particularly teachers' aides; 3) public schools have, on average, a lower administrator to student ratio than do the private schools; 4) nonsectarian elementary and secondary schools have the lowest student-teacher ratios: less than 10 to 1 compared to 25 to 1 in public schools, 27 to 1 in Catholic parochial elementary schools and 14 to 1 in other religious schools; 5) professional support staff are employed more often at the secondary level.

Note in Tables IV.10 the differences in mean totals of staff in each type of school. Nonsectarian elementary schools had more total staff -- full- and part-time -- than did the public elementary schools, eventhough their enrollments were, on average, less than half of the public school enrollments. Note also the more extensive use of part-time teachers in the private sector, particularly nonsectarian schools, and the comparatively larger staffs in the public secondary schools.

TABLE IV.10: TOTAL NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF STAFF

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
# OF FULL TIME SCH SITE ADMIN,COMBINED	MEAN NUMBER	1.2	2.4	2.0	1.7	2.4	1.9
# OF PART TIME SCH SITE ADMIN,COMBINED	MEAN NUMBER	0.1	1.8	1.0	1.5	1.5	1.1
# OF FULL TIME TEACHERS	MEAN NUMBER	17.3	8.5	8.0	10.7	17.4	13.1
# OF PART TIME TEACHERS	MEAN NUMBER	1.3	2.1	0.0	2.2	6.0	2.3
# OF FULL TIME PROF SUPPORT PERSONNEL	MEAN NUMBER	0.8	0.1	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.4
# OF PART TIME PROF SUPPORT PERSONNEL	MEAN NUMBER	0.1	0.4	0.0	0.4	0.8	0.3
# OF FULL TIME AIDES	MEAN NUMBER	0.6	0.1	0.0	0.4	1.2	0.5
# OF PART TIME AIDES	MEAN NUMBER	8.4	0.5	0.0	1.3	2.7	3.9
# OF FULL TIME NON INSTRUC STAFF	MEAN NUMBER	3.1	1.0	2.0	1.8	2.4	2.3
# OF PART TIME NON INSTRUC STAFF	MEAN NUMBER	0.5	1.2	1.0	1.4	2.5	1.1

TABLE IV.10: TOTAL NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF STAFF

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
# OF FULL TIME SCH SITE ADMIN,COMBINED	MEAN NUMBER	4.2	4.8	3.0	2.5	4.2	4.1
# OF PART TIME SCH SITE ADMIN,COMBINED	MEAN NUMBER	0.2	1.8	4.0	1.5	1.6	0.7
# OF FULL TIME TEACHERS	MEAN NUMBER	50.4	31.6	24.8	8.0	23.4	43.4
# OF PART TIME TEACHERS	MEAN NUMBER	3.9	10.2	4.8	2.0	5.6	4.5
# OF FULL TIME PROF SUPPORT PERSONNEL	MEAN NUMBER	4.4	2.2	1.6	2.0	1.1	3.6
# OF PART TIME PROF SUPPORT PERSONNEL	MEAN NUMBER	0.2	4.4	2.0	0.0	0.7	0.6
# OF FULL TIME AIDES	MEAN NUMBER	3.2	0.4	0.8	0.5	0.0	2.5
# OF PART TIME AIDES	MEAN NUMBER	5.6	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	4.3
# OF FULL TIME NON INSTRUC STAFF	MEAN NUMBER	13.4	3.6	3.8	4.0	6.2	11.2
# OF PART TIME NON INSTRUC STAFF	MEAN NUMBER	0.7	2.0	2.3	0.0	1.4	0.8

Compare the mean totals in the tables just presented to the mean totals per 100 pupil enrollment shown in Tables IV.11. The average nonsectarian elementary school had 21 full- and part-time staff members per 100 pupils, one for every 5 students, compared to 8.3 staff members per 100 pupils in the public elementary school. Although public secondary schools had, on average, the largest staffs, they had the least number of total staff per 100 pupils -- 6.9, or one full- or part-time staff member for every 14 students. As previously noted, they also had the least number of administrators per 100 pupil enrollment -- approximately one for every 200 students, compared to one for every 40 students in the nonsectarian secondary school, and one for every 55 to 65 studnets in the other school categories.

Catholic parochial elementary schools had the highest student-teacher ratio -- about 28 to 1, followed closely by public schools with student-teacher ratios at both elementary and secondary levels of 25 to 1. Other categories of private schools had smaller student-teacher ratios: Catholic parochial secondary, 20 to 1; Catholic private secondary, 15 to 1; other religious elementary and secondary, 14 to 1; nonsectarian secondary, 9 to 1; and nonsectarian elementary, 8 to 1.

TABLE IV.11: TOTAL NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF STAFF PER 100 PUPILS

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
FULL TIME ADMIN PER 100 ENR	MEAN #	0.3	0.9	1.1	0.9	1.4	0.7
PART TIME ADMIN PER 100 ENR	MEAN #	0.3	0.6	0.5	0.9	1.0	0.7
FULL TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	MEAN #	4.0	2.9	4.3	5.7	8.6	4.3
PART TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	MEAN #	0.3	0.7	0.0	1.6	3.6	1.0
FULL TIME PROF SUPP PER 100 ENR	MEAN #	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	[illegible]	0.1
PART TIMME PROF SUPP PER 100 ENR	MEAN #	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.4	0.1
FULL TIME AIDES PER 100 ENR	MEAN #	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.4	1.1	0.2
PART TIME AIDES PER 100 ENR	MEAN #	2.2	0.2	0.0	1.2	3.1	1.4
FULL TIME STAFF PER 100 ENR	MEAN #	0.7	0.3	1.1	0.7	1.0	0.7
PART TIME STAFF PER 100 ENR	MEAN #	0.2	0.4	0.5	1.1	1.1	0.5

80

TABLE IV.11: TOTAL NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF STAFF PER 100 PUPILS

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
FULL TIME ADMIN PER 100 ENR	MEAN #	0.4	0.5	0.9	1.4	1.5	0.6
PART TIME ADMIN PER 100 ENR	MEAN #	0.2	0.2	1.0	1.2	0.7	0.6
FULL TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	MEAN #	3.8	3.8	5.4	5.2	8.5	4.5
PART TIME TCHRS PER 100 ENR	MEAN #	0.3	1.3	1.1	2.1	2.1	0.6
FULL TIME PROF SUPP PER 100 ENR	MEAN #	0.3	0.3	0.3	1.2	0.4	0.4
PART TIMME PROF SUPP PER 100 ENR	MEAN #	0.0	0.6	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.1
FULL TIME AIDES PER 100 ENR	MEAN #	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.2
PART TIME AIDES PER 100 ENR	MEAN #	0.5	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.4
FULL TIME STAFF PER 100 ENR	MEAN #	1.1	0.5	1.2	3.2	2.3	1.2
PART TIME STAFF PER 100 ENR	MEAN #	0.1	0.5	0.3	0.0	0.6	0.1

2. Volunteer Services Received by the School

Public and private schools were asked to estimate the level of contributed or volunteer services received by their schools during the most recent year for various categories of service. Schools responded using the following scale:

0 = None
1 = 1 to 10 total person-days per year
2 = 11 to 25 total person-days per year
3 = 26 to 50 person- days per year
4 = 51 to 75 person-days per year
5 = 75 or more total person-days per year

We interpreted a 'person-day' as one person for one day. However, no explanation was given of a 'person-day' and it is possible that schools interpreted this differently. Differing interpretations may have affected our results.

In Tables IV.12, the mean numbers refer not to the actual number of person days, but to the scale used above. Therefore, a mean of 2.9 can be interpreted as a volunteer level of between 11 and 25 person-days per year. The abbreviations in the left hand column stand for: professional services (physician, lawyer, accountant); instructional services (teachers, aides and media personnel); supporting services -- athletic events; supporting services -- other extracurricular (advisors, group leaders); transportation services (bus drivers, mechanics); and maintenance services (custodian, gardener).

There are several interesting results. At the elementary level, nonsectarian and Catholic parochial schools had the highest levels of volunteer service in almost all categories. Surprisingly, public schools reported a higher level of service for instructional purposes, 26 to 50 person-days per year. At the secondary level, private schools, with the exception of nonsectarian, reported higher levels of volunteer service than did public schools in most categories. At both levels, there were more contributed and volunteer services for the purposes of instruction and fundraising in all types of schools. For example, Catholic parochial secondary schools had, on average, 51 to 75 person-days of fundraising per year; other religious and nonsectarian secondary schools had 26 to 50 person-days of fundraising per year.

TABLE IV.12: CONTRIBUTED AND VOLUNTEER SERVICES RECEIVED BY THE SCHOOI

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
# OF PERSDAYS PROF SERVICE CONTRIBUTED	MEAN RATING	0.5	0.8	1.0	0.5	0.8	0.7
# PERSDAYS INSTR SERV CONTRIBUTED	MEAN RATING	3.0	2.9	1.0	1.9	1.4	2.7
# OF PERSDAYS SUPPORT SERV CONTRIBUTED	MEAN RATING	0.5	2.8	0.0	1.1	0.7	1.5
# OF PERSDAYS EXTRACURR SERV CONTRIBTD	MEAN RATING	1.0	1.6	0.0	0.5	0.7	1.1
# OF PERSDAYS TRANSP SERV CONTRIBUTED	MEAN RATING	0.9	1.0	0.0	0.8	1.0	0.9
# OF PERSDAYS MAINT SERV CONTRIBUTED	MEAN RATING	0.8	1.8	1.0	0.6	1.5	1.2
# OF PERSDAYS FUNDRAISING CONTRIBUTED	MEAN RATING	2.4	3.0	1.0	1.9	2.4	2.6

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
# OF PERSDAYS PROF SERVICE CONTRIBUTED	MEAN RATING	0.5	2.4	1.4	0.5	1.0	0.7
# PERSDAYS INSTR SERV CONTRIBUTED	MEAN RATING	1.9	2.6	1.4	2.5	0.3	1.8
# OF PERSDAYS SUPPORT SERV CONTRIBUTED	MEAN RATING	1.6	2.6	2.4	2.5	0.4	1.6
# OF PERSDAYS EXTRACURR SERV CONTRIBTD	MEAN RATING	1.8	2.0	0.8	2.5	0.4	1.6
# OF PERSDAYS TRANSP SERV CONTRIBUTED	MEAN RATING	0.6	1.4	1.4	2.5	0.0	0.7
# OF PERSDAYS MAINT SERV CONTRIBUTED	MEAN RATING	0.6	1.0	1.4	2.5	0.0	0.7
# OF PERSDAYS FUNDRAISING CONTRIBUTED	MEAN RATING	1.7	4.0	1.6	3.0	3.0	2.0

3. Existence of Salary Schedules

We assumed that virtually all of the public schools have a formal salary schedule, and therefore secured data for private schools only. Very limited data were available from Catholic schools. The majority of private schools had salary schedules for elementary teachers (see Tables IV.13). Nonsectarian schools showed the most variation, yet even 80% of these schools had a formal salary schedule for elementary teachers. At the secondary level, 56% of the nonsectarian schools reported formal salary schedules for teachers.

Fewer schools had salary schedule for administrators. The few Catholic parochial and private schools that responded had formal schedules for all their elementary administrators, but did not have them for any secondary school administrators. Only 40% of the nonsectarian elementary and 22% of nonsectarian secondary schools had formal salary schedules for administrators.

TABLE IV.13: EXISTENCE OF SALARY SCHEDULES IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE								TOTAL RETURNS	
	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN			
	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM
SCHL HAS FORMAL SALARY SCHED FOR TCHRS										
NO	0	0	0	0	1	5.9	4	20.0	5	12.5
YES	2	100.0	1	100.0	16	94.1	16	80.0	35	87.5
TOTAL RETURNS	2	100.0	1	100.0	17	100.0	20	100.0	40	100.0
SCHL HAS FORMAL SALARY SCHED FOR ADMIN										
NO	0	0	0	0	5	29.4	12	60.0	17	100.0
YES	2	100.0	1	100.0	12	70.6	8	40.0	23	100.0
TOTAL RETURNS	2	100.0	1	100.0	17	100.0	20	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE IV.13: EXISTENCE OF SALARY SCHEDULES IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE								TOTAL RETURNS	
	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN			
	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM
SCHL HAS FORMAL SALARY SCHED FOR TCHRS										
NO	0	0	0	0	1	50.0	4	44.4	5	35.7
YES	1	100.0	2	100.0	1	50.0	5	55.6	9	64.3
TOTAL RETURNS	1	100.0	2	100.0	2	100.0	9	100.0	14	100.0
SCHL HAS FORMAL SALARY SCHED FOR ADMIN										
NO	1	100.0	2	100.0	1	50.0	7	77.8	11	100.0
YES	0	0	0	0	1	50.0	2	22.2	3	100.0
TOTAL RETURNS	1	100.0	2	100.0	2	100.0	9	100.0	14	100.0

5. Salary Ranges in Public and Private Schools

Teachers have the potential to receive higher salaries in the public sector. The highest teacher salary in a public elementary school was, on average, $11,500 to $12,500 more than the highest teacher salary in a private elementary school. The mean highest teacher salary for public secondary schools was $29,653, or about $5200 more than Catholic parochial secondary schools which had the next highest salary. The salary ranges in public schools ($15,000 at elementary and $20,000 at secondary) were almost double those of the private schools. (See Tables IV.14).

There was no consistent pattern of salary levels among private schools. At the elementary level, other religious schools had the highest average salary ($16,785), followed closely by nonsectarian school ($16,610). Catholic parochial schools($24,420) led the private secondary schools in teacher salary levels, followed again by nonsectarian schools($23,625) and Catholic private schools ($22,418). All teacher salary levels increase at the secondary level, with two exceptions. The mean salary for the lowest paid public secondary school teacher dropped from about $12,600 to $9700, representing perhaps lower salaries for driver's education teachers and some coaches. The mean salaries for other religious schools dropped considerably, but only two schools responded to the questionnaire.

Average salaries for administrators in the public schools were also higher than those for private school administrators. Top administrators in nonsectarian secondary schools received, on average, $37,800 -- close to the $38,800 paid to top administrators in public secondary schools. As was the case for teachers, secondary school administrators had higher salaries than did elementary school administrators.

TABLE IV.14: SALARY LEVELS AND RANGES IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
LOWEST SALARY PAID ADMINISTRATORS	MEAN SALARY	32289.7	8259.0	6480.0	19122.7	13113.3	23536.4
HIGHEST SALARY PAID ADMINISTRATORS	MEAN SALARY	34251.6	12748.3	6480.0	22923.2	29132.4	26867.2
LOWEST SALARY PAID TEACHERS	MEAN SALARY	12614.5	10400.7	6480.0	10769.9	10396.8	11310.3
HIGHEST SALARY PAID TEACHERS	MEAN SALARY	27338.9	14651.4	14445.0	16785.5	16610.0	20268.1

TABLE IV.14: SALARY LEVELS AND RANGES IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
LOWEST SALARY PAID ADMINISTRATORS	MEAN SALARY	27791.6	18054.0	15000.0	7655.5	16433.3	25071.9
HIGHEST SALARY PAID ADMINISTRATORS	MEAN SALARY	38804.6	24350.4	22375.0	11070.0	37816.7	36110.2
LOWEST SALARY PAID TEACHERS	MEAN SALARY	9725.8	11522.0	11078.4	7696.0	12882.5	10205.5
HIGHEST SALARY PAID TEACHERS	MEAN SALARY	29653.4	24428.4	22418.4	10922.5	23625.0	27730.9

6. Racial and Ethnic Composition of Staff

The vast majority of administrators and teachers in any type of school were white (see Tables IV.15). The lowest percentages of white administrators were in public schools where 82% of secondary and 88% of elementary administrators were white. Private schools reported that between 94% and 100% of their adminstrators were white. Blacks and 'other minorities' were better represented than hispanics among secondary school administrators; hispanics had slightly greater representation in public elementary schools.

Minorities had more representation in the teachers' ranks. Twenty-six percent of the teachers in Catholic private secondary schools were minorities -- 23% hispanic, 3% black. About 15% of public elementary and other religious schools teachers were minorities; 5% of other religious elementary and 10% of other religious secondary were black. About 8% of nonsectarian elementary school staffs were minorities, as were about 5% of their secondary school staffs.

Professional support personnel are also predominantly white, particularly at the secondary level where 100% of Catholic private, nonsectarian and other religious professional support staff were white. Public schools, and Catholic parochial and nonsectarian elementary were the only school types whose professional suppport staffs were at least 10% minority.

It is only among teachers' aides and support staff that we begin to see significant percentages of minorities among the staff. For example, about 35% of Catholic parochial elementary school aides and about 50% of Catholic parochial secondary school support staff were minorities. Among aides and support staff, blacks and hispanics were more widely represented.

Tables IV.15 are quite detailed, but the overall patterns discussed in the preceding paragraphs can be observed by scanning the right hand column ,'Total Returns', which gives the weighted average for each row. There one can easily see the high percentages of white administrators, teachers and professional support staff, and the greater minority representation among teachers' aides and support staff.

TABLE IV.15: RACIAL AND ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF STAFF

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
% WHITE ADMINISTRATORS	MEAN %	88.7	96.5	100.0	99.4	100.0	93.9
% BLACK ADMINISTRATORS	MEAN %	3.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8
% HISPANIC ADMINISTRATORS	MEAN %	3.5	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2
% OTHER MINORITY ADMINISTRATORS	MEAN %	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	3.2
% WHITE TEACHERS	MEAN %	88.0	89.4	71.4	84.7	87.7	88.1
% BLACK TEACHERS	MEAN %	4.1	6.2	14.3	9.7	7.8	5.9
% HISPANIC TEACHERS	MEAN %	2.5	4.0	14.3	2.5	1.2	3.0
% OTHER MINORITY TEACHERS	MEAN %	5.4	7.4	0.0	3.1	3.3	4.7
% WHITE PROF SUPP PERS	MEAN %	89.6	82.2	0	100.0	88.9	87.1
% BLACK PROF SUPP PERS	MEAN %	3.4	3.6	0	0.0	0.0	2.9
% HISPANIC PROF SUPP PERS	MEAN %	1.4	14.2	0	0.0	0.0	6.9
% OTHER MINORITY PROF SUPP PERS	MEAN %	5.6	0.0	0	0.0	11.1	5.6
% WHITE AIDES	MEAN %	81.3	65.5	0	85.4	80.4	76.8
% BLACK AIDES	MEAN %	4.9	10.7	0	10.4	11.9	7.7
% HISPANIC AIDES	MEAN %	10.9	23.5	0	4.2	3.5	13.5
% OTHER MINORITY AIDES	MEAN %	2.8	10.0	0	0.0	4.2	2.8
% WHITE SUPPORT STAFF	MEAN %	75.2	65.4	33.3	79.0	71.7	70.9
% BLACK SUPPORT STAFF	MEAN %	10.6	10.4	0.0	18.2	9.6	10.9
% HISPANIC SUPPORT STAFF	MEAN %	11.4	23.4	66.7	2.8	14.1	16.2
% OTHER MINORITY SUPPORT STAFF	MEAN %	2.8	16.7	0.0	0.0	4.6	3.2

TABLE IV.15: RACIAL AND ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF STAFF

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
% WHITE ADMINISTRATORS	MEAN %	82.3	95.0	100.0	100.0	93.8	85.4
% BLACK ADMINISTRATORS	MEAN %	7.4	5.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	6.1
% HISPANIC ADMINISTRATORS	MEAN %	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7
% OTHER MINORITY ADMINISTRATORS	MEAN %	5.5	0	0.0	0.0	4.8	5.2
% WHITE TEACHERS	MEAN %	84.8	92.6	74.0	86.7	95.6	85.6
% BLACK TEACHERS	MEAN %	4.7	3.2	2.9	5.0	1.3	4.2
% HISPANIC TEACHERS	MEAN %	5.5	3.2	23.2	0.0	1.8	6.1
% OTHER MINORITY TEACHERS	MEAN %	5.0	4.2	0.0	8.3	1.4	4.7
% WHITE PROF SUPP PERS	MEAN %	84.5	91.7	100.0	100.0	100.0	87.3
% BLACK PROF SUPP PERS	MEAN %	5.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.6
% HISPANIC PROF SUPP PERS	MEAN %	8.1	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7
% OTHER MINORITY PROF SUPP PERS	MEAN %	1.6	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4
% WHITE AIDES	MEAN %	62.1	0	100.0	100.0	0	63.5
% BLACK AIDES	MEAN %	16.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	15.4
% HISPANIC AIDES	MEAN %	11.4	0	0.0	0.0	0	11.0
% OTHER MINORITY AIDES	MEAN %	10.5	0	0	0.0	0	10.3
% WHITE SUPPORT STAFF	MEAN %	69.8	49.2	83.6	83.3	94.1	72.0
% BLACK SUPPORT STAFF	MEAN %	11.0	4.2	5.0	0.0	0.0	9.2
% HISPANIC SUPPORT STAFF	MEAN %	10.9	46.6	11.4	0.0	5.9	11.8
% OTHER MINORITY SUPPORT STAFF	MEAN %	8.3	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	7.7

7. Sex of Staff

Percentages of male and female staff members differed considerably according to school level and school type (see Tables IV. 16). In general, the majority of administrators, teachers, professional staff, aides, and support staff in all school types at the elementary level were female. In contrast, the majority of administrators and teachers at the secondary level were male, except among Catholic schools where 67% to 83% were female. Female administrators also received slighlty more representation in the public sector. Within elementary and secondary levels, there were slightly higher percentages of male administrators than there were male teachers, except in Catholic parochial elementary schools where 100% of the administrators were female. At each level, the highest percentages of female administrators and teachers were in the Catholic schools; the lowest percentages were in other religious schools.

At the elementary level, 74% to 96% of the teachers were female. A majority of administrators in each school category at the elementary level were also female, but there were slightly higher percentages of male administrators than male teachers for each category. The majority of professional support staff, aides, and support staff were also female with two exceptions: 75% of the professional support staff in public elementary schools were male; and, interestingly, the Catholic parochial elementary schools did not report any professional support staff.

There were increases of male administrators, teachers, and other staff members in almost every school category at the secondary level. Between 55% and 62% of the teachers in nonsectarian, other religious, and public schools were male. However, 74% to 83% of Catholic parochial and private secondary school teachers were female. Although 67% of the Catholic parochial secondary school administratos were female, 64% to 100% of the administrators in the other school cateogries were male. Patterns for professional support staff, aides and support staff were less consistent at the secondary level.

90

TABLE IV.16: SEX OF STAFF

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
% MALE ADMINISTRATORS	MEAN %	29.3	0.0	0.0	45.5	30.1	30.7
% FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS	MEAN %	70.7	100.0	100.0	54.5	69.9	69.3
% MALE TEACHERS	MEAN %	21.2	3.8	0.0	26.0	21.7	59.1
% FEMALE TEACHERS	MEAN %	78.8	96.2	100.0	74.0	78.3	40.9
% MALE PROF SUPP PERS	MEAN %	74.6	0	0	2.8	3.6	55.6
% FEMALE PROF SUPP PERS	MEAN %	25.4	0	0	97.2	96.4	44.4
% MALE AIDES	MEAN %	9.2	0.0	0	8.0	15.8	9.6
% FEMALE AIDES	MEAN %	90.8	100.0	0	92.0	84.2	90.4
% MALE SUPPORT STAFF	MEAN %	42.1	16.7	66.7	24.2	37.9	39.4
% FEMALE SUPPORT STAFF	MEAN %	57.9	83.3	33.3	75.8	62.1	60.6

TABLE IV.16: SEX OF STAFF

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
% MALE ADMINISTRATORS	MEAN %	63.6	33.3	100.0	75.0	71.0	64.6
% FEMALE ADMINISTRATORS	MEAN %	36.4	66.7	0.0	25.0	29.0	35.4
% MALE TEACHERS	MEAN %	61.6	16.7	25.9	60.0	54.6	59.6
% FEMALE TEACHERS	MEAN %	38.4	83.3	74.1	40.0	45.4	40.4
% MALE PROF SUPP PERS	MEAN %	57.4	33.3	0.0	66.7	25.0	54.1
% FEMALE PROF SUPP PERS	MEAN %	42.6	66.7	100.0	33.3	75.0	45.9
% MALE AIDES	MEAN %	16.7	0.0	0	0.0	0	16.1
% FEMALE AIDES	MEAN %	83.3	100.0	0	100.0	0	83.9
% MALE SUPPORT STAFF	MEAN %	35.3	0	33.3	66.7	28.6	35.3
% FEMALE SUPPORT STAFF	MEAN %	64.7	0	66.7	33.3	71.4	64.7

8. Type of Employment Negotiations.

Schools were asked to indicate which of the following statements best described the nature of employment negotiations on wages, hours of employment, and other terms and conditions of employment of teachers for the 1981-82 school year:

a. Formal negotiations with a teachers organization which led to a written agreement
b. Informal negotiations with a teachers organization which did not lead to a written agreement
c. Individual negotiation between the school and individual employees
d. Wages, hours and terms and conditions of employment are essentially determined unilaterally by the school.

Tables IV.17 present the percentages of schools represented by each of the above types of employment negotiation. The data suggest that public schools at both the elementary and secondary levels have formal negotiations; nonsectarian and other religious schools at both levels tend to determine wages and conditions of employment unilaterally. One hundred percent of public elementary schools and 92% of public secondary schools used formal negotiations. In contrast, 57% of nonsectarian elementary, 63% of nonsectarian secondary, and 77% of other religious elementary schools determined wages and employment conditions unilaterally. Catholic parochial schools were the only private schools to use formal negotiations at the secondary level; 60% used such negotiations. Catholic parochial schools used primarily a combination of individual negotiations and school wage determination at the elementary level.

TABLE IV.17: TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT NEGOTIATIONS

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE											
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN		TOTAL RETURNS	
	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM
TYPE OF EMPLOYMNT NEGOTIATIONS												
FORMAL NEGOTIATIONS	37	100.0	7	11.7	0	0	0	0	2	9.5	46	33.8
INFORMAL NEGOTIATIONS	0	0	2	3.3	0	0	1	5.9	2	9.5	5	3.7
INDIVIDUAL NEGOTIATIONS	0	0	21	35.0	1	100.0	3	17.6	5	23.8	30	22.1
SCHOOL DETERM WAGES ETC	0	0	30	50.0	0	0	13	76.5	12	57.1	55	40.4
TOTAL RETURNS	37	100.0	60	100.0	1	100.0	17	100.0	21	100.0	136	100.0

TABLE IV.17: TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT NEGOTIATIONS

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE											
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN		TOTAL RETURNS	
	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM
TYPE OF EMPLOYMNT NEGOTIATIONS												
FORMAL NEGOTIATIONS	44	91.7	3	60.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	70.1
INFORMAL NEGOTIATIONS	4	8.3	0	0	2	40.0	0	0	2	25.0	8	11.9
INDIVIDUAL NEGOTIATIONS	0	0	1	20.0	1	20.0	0	0	1	12.5	3	4.5
SCHOOL DETERM WAGES ETC	0	0	1	20.0	2	40.0	1	100.0	5	62.5	9	13.4
TOTAL RETURNS	48	100.0	5	100.0	5	100.0	1	100.0	8	100.0	67	100.0

9. Experience of Teaching Staff at Current School

Tables IV.18 show the mean percentages of teaching staff with five or less years or more than five years of teaching experience in their current schools. These numbers do not represent the total years of teaching experience for any given teacher.

About 80% of public elementary and secondary teachers had been at their current schools for more than five years when the questionnaires were filled out. Between 64% and 75% of Catholic parochial and Catholic private school teachers had been teaching at their current schools for more than five years. In contrast, only about 38% of nonsectarian elementary and secondary, 33% of elementary and 15% of secondary teachers in other religious schools had been employed in their current schools for more than five years.

TABLE IV.18: TOTAL EXPERIENCE OF TEACHING STAFF

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
% TEACHERS W/ <= 5 YRS EXPER	MEAN %	21.3	35.6	29.4	67.5	62.6	36.2
% TEACHERS W/ > 5 YRS EXPER	MEAN %	78.7	64.4	70.6	32.5	37.4	63.8

TABLE IV.18: TOTAL EXPERIENCE OF TEACHING STAFF

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
% TEACHERS W/ <= 5 YRS EXPER	MEAN %	21.0	30.1	24.5	85.0	61.7	27.9
% TEACHERS W/ > 5 YRS EXPER	MEAN %	79.0	69.9	75.5	15.0	38.3	72.1

10. Educational Qualifications of Teaching Staff

The vast majority of teachers in both public and private sectors hold BA degrees (see Tables IV.19). Only 8% of Catholic parochial and 4% of nonsectarian elementary teachers do not have BA's. The small percent (.3%) of public secondary school teachers who do not hold BA degrees may possibly represent driver's education or vocational education teachers.

All types of public and private elementary schools, with the exception of our single Catholic private respondent, have roughly the same percentages of teachers with a masters degree or higher (between 23% and 29%). The percent of secondary school teachers with a masters degree or higher is significantly greater for all school types -- 45%-47% for public, Catholic parochial and private, and other religious schools; a striking 70% of nonsectarian secondary school teachers held masters degrees.

TABLE IV.19: EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS OF TEACHING STAFF

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
% TCHRS WITH NO BA DEGREE	MEAN %	0.1	8.0	0.0	0.7	4.4	3.6
% TCHRS WWITH BA DEGREE ONLY	MEAN %	71.4	69.6	0.0	75.9	68.8	70.5
% TCHRS WITH MASTERS DEGREE OR HIGHER	MEAN %	28.5	22.5	100.0	23.3	26.8	25.9

TABLE IV.19: EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS OF TEACHING STAFF

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
% TCHRS WITH NO BA DEGREE	MEAN %	0.2	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.8	0.3
% TCHRS WWITH BA DEGREE ONLY	MEAN %	55.6	54.4	51.5	58.3	29.7	52.6
% TCHRS WITH MASTERS DEGREE OR HIGHER	MEAN %	44.1	45.6	47.9	41.7	69.5	47.1

11. Employment Termination

Schools were asked to note the number of teachers who left school during the last two years for the following reasons:

1) Budget cuts or declining enrollments
2) Leave of absence
3) Unsatisfactory performance
4) Retirement
5) Death
6) Other (family reasons, employment opportunities, etc.)

The far left column in Tables IV.20 correspond to these six reasons for employment termination. The numbers in the columns are the mean percents of full- and part-time teachers who terminated employment for each school category.

The most striking results of this question were the higher percentages of teachers in private schools who were released because of unsatisfactory performance. For example, about 33% of nonsectarian, 32% of Cathlic private, and 14% of Catholic parochial secondary teachers were terminated for unsatisfactory performance compared to only 6% of public secondary teachers. This same pattern holds true for elementary schools, but the percentages are smaller.

Higher percentages of teachers in public schools were laid-off, granted leave or retired. Note that the percentages of teachers leaving school for other, personal reasons were generally higher than the other reasons given by private school officials. These personal reasons appear to be the most common reason for teachers in the private sector to terminate their employment.

These percentages do not reflect the relative numbers of teachers who terminated their employment within the various school types. A different analysis of these data, although not presented here, showed that overalll turnover rates in the public sector were slightly lower than those in the private sector.

TABLE IV.20: MEAN PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS IN THE SCHOOL WHO HAVE TERMINATED EMPLOYMENT IN THE LAST TWO YEARS BY REASON FOR TERMINATION

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
% OF TCHS LEAVING,LAID-OFF	MEAN %	40.6	2.1	50.0	1.8	0.6	16.9
% OF TCHS LEAVING,GRANTED LEAVE	MEAN %	21.3	6.0	50.0	0.4	23.5	13.7
% OF TCHS LEAVING,FIRED	MEAN %	1.8	13.5	0.0	9.3	12.6	8.4
% OF TCHS LEAVING,RETIRED	MEAN %	16.1	3.2	0.0	5.4	10.8	9.2
% OF TCHS LEAVING,DIED	MEAN %	3.1	0.5	0.0	0.0	5.9	2.1
% OF TCHS LEAVING,OTHER REASONS	MEAN %	17.2	74.6	0.0	83.1	46.6	49.6

TABLE IV.20: MEAN PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS IN THE SCHOOL WHO HAVE TERMINATED EMPLOYMENT IN THE LAST TWO YEARS BY REASON FOR TERMINATION

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
% OF TCHS LEAVING,LAID-OFF	MEAN %	26.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.4
% OF TCHS LEAVING,GRANTED LEAVE	MEAN %	24.0	13.3	15.0	0.0	0.0	19.5
% OF TCHS LEAVING,FIRED	MEAN %	6.2	14.0	31.7	0.0	33.3	11.6
% OF TCHS LEAVING,RETIRED	MEAN %	23.7	0.0	5.0	0.0	1.6	17.8
% OF TCHS LEAVING,DIED	MEAN %	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7
% OF TCHS LEAVING,OTHER REASONS	MEAN %	16.4	72.7	28.3	100.0	65.1	28.0

E. SCHOOL PHILOSOPHY AND PRACTICES

1. Basis for Student Admissions

Private school officials were asked to indicate which of the following criteria were used to evaluate students for admission:

a) Academic Record (grades or teacher reports)
b) Achievement or aptitude test results
c) Athletic Ability
d) Other extra-curricular activities
e) Religious affiliation
f) Family involvement in a particular religious organization
g) Relative of alumni or current student
h) Personal recommendation
i) Psychological test results
j) Affirmative Action

The abbreviations in Tables IV.21 correspond to these criteria. The school officials were asked to indicate a '1' if the criterion was required; a '2' if it was considered; and a '3' if it was not considerd for admission. The numbers between 1 and 3 in Tables III.21 are the mean ratings of the school officials using this ranking scheme. A mean rating close to 1 indicates that most schools in the category either required or considered the criterion for admission; a ranking close to 3 indicates the criterion was not considered.

As one would expect, the vast majority of elementary and secondary schools (mean ratings between 1.0 and 2.0) required or considered student academic records, achievement and/or aptitude tests, and personal recommendations for admission. Religious affiliation and family involvement in a religious organization were considered for admission to Catholic and other religious schools. Psychological tests were considered to a moderate degree by all the schools, least of all Catholic private secondary. Sibling or alumni status were considered by nonsectarian and Catholic schools (mean rating of about 2); other religious schools did not consider these admissions criteria.

There are several interesting results. Athletic ability and involvement in extra-curricular activities were more important admissions criteria at the secondary level, particularly to Catholic private and nonsectarian schools. The mean ratings for nonsectarian secondary schools considering student athletic ability as a criterion was 2.2; for student involvement in extra-curricular activities, it was 1.9. Nonsectarian schools and the two Catholic private elementary schools considered affirmative action in evaluating students for admission (means ranging between 2.0 and 2.4). Affirmative action appeared to be a less important admissions criterion to the other types of schools, particularly at the secondary level (mean ratings of 3.0)

TABLE IV.21: BASIS FOR STUDENT ADMISSIONS

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
BASIS FOR STDNT ADMISS=GRADES	MEAN RATING	1.4	1.0	1.4	1.7	1.4
BASIS FOR STDNT ADMISS=APTITUDE TEST	MEAN RATING	1.6	2.0	1.3	1.8	1.6
BASIS FOR STDNT ADMISS=ATHLETC ABILITY	MEAN RATING	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.9	3.0
BASIS FOR STDNT ADMISS=EXTRA CURR ACTIV	MEAN RATING	2.8	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.8
BASIS FOR STDNT ADMISS=RELIGIOUS AFFIL	MEAN RATING	2.0	2.0	2.2	2.9	2.2
BASIS FOR STDNT ADMISS=FAMILY INVOLV	MEAN RATING	2.1	2.0	2.5	3.0	2.3
BASIS FOR STDNT ADMISS=RELATV OF ALUMNI	MEAN RATING	2.2	2.0	2.7	2.1	2.3
BASIS FOR STDNT ADMISS=PERS RECOMMEND	MEAN RATING	2.0	2.0	1.9	2.0	2.0
BASIS FOR STDNT ADMISS=PSYCH TESTS	MEAN RATING	2.5	2.0	2.4	2.4	2.4
BASIS FOR STDNT ADMISS=AFFIRMATV ACTION	MEAN RATING	2.4	2.0	2.6	2.1	2.4

TABLE IV.21: BASIS FOR STUDENT ADMISSIONS

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
BASIS FOR STDNT ADMISS=GRADES	MEAN RATING	1.0	1.0	1.5	1.0	1.0
BASIS FOR STDNT ADMISS=APTITUDE TEST	MEAN RATING	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.1	1.1
BASIS FOR STDNT ADMISS=ATHLETC ABILITY	MEAN RATING	2.8	2.4	3.0	2.2	2.5
BASIS FOR STDNT ADMISS=EXTRA CURR ACTIV	MEAN RATING	2.6	2.2	3.0	1.9	2.2
BASIS FOR STDNT ADMISS=RELIGIOUS AFFIL	MEAN RATING	2.0	2.4	1.5	2.9	2.4
BASIS FOR STDNT ADMISS=FAMILY INVOLV	MEAN RATING	2.2	2.4	2.5	2.9	2.5
BASIS FOR STDNT ADMISS=RELATV OF ALUMNI	MEAN RATING	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.1	2.1
BASIS FOR STDNT ADMISS=PERS RECOMMEND	MEAN RATING	1.8	1.8	1.5	1.2	1.5
BASIS FOR STDNT ADMISS=PSYCH TESTS	MEAN RATING	2.3	3.0	2.5	2.6	2.6
BASIS FOR STDNT ADMISS=AFFIRMATV ACTION	MEAN RATING	3.0	2.4	3.0	2.4	2.6

2. Emphasis of the School on Specific Student Outcomes

We were interested in determining differences among school types with regard to emphasis on student outcomes. Did a particular school stress basic skills, critical thinking, college preparation and/or social development? Do public schools differ, in general, dramatically from private schools in what they emphasize? Tables IV.22 present the mean percentages (in fraction format) of each school type which emphasized the specific student outcomes in which we were interested. Categories should be self-explanatory except for two: religious values also includes ethical values, and social development refers as well to cultural pluralism.

There is one striking result. Only 60% of public elementary and 40% of public secondary schools emphasized critical thinking compared to between 80% and 100% of the private school types. The majority of public and private schools also emphasized basic skills, the development of self-esteem, and social development. The one exception was nonsectarian secondary schools, of which only 30% emphasized self-esteem and 10% emphasized social development. Basic skills and self-esteem were the most frequently emphasized outcomes at the elementary level; basic skills and college preparation were the most frequently cited outcomes at the secondary level.

Another interesting result is in relation to 'respect for authority instilled'. The majority of Catholic and other religious schools (90%-100%) and public elementary schools (70%) emphasized instilling repect for authority. In contrast, only 40% of nonsectarian elementary and 20% of nonsectarian secondary schools emphasized respect for authority. Vocational education was emphasized by Catholic private (60%), other religious (50%), and to a smaller extent, public (40%) secondary schools. Vocational education was not emphasized at all by nonsectarian schools.

TABLE IV.22: EMPHASIS OF THE SCHOOL ON SPECIFIC STUDENT OUTCOMES

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
SCHL EMPHASIS ON COLLEGE PREP	MEAN RATING	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.5	0.4	0.2
SCHL EMPHASIS ON BASIC SKILLS	MEAN RATING	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.9	1.0
SCHL EMPHASIS ON CRITICAL THINKI	MEAN RATING	0.6	0.8	1.0	0.8	0.9	0.7
RESPECT FOR AUTHCRITY EMPHASIZED	MEAN RATING	0.7	0.9	1.0	1.0	0.4	0.8
VOCATIONAL PREPARATION EMPHASIZED	MEAN RATING	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1
SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT EMPHASIZED	MEAN RATING	0.6	0.8	1.0	0.5	0.8	0.7
SELF ESTEEM EMPHASIZED	MEAN RATING	0.9	1.0	1.0	0.8	0.9	0.9
RELIGIOUS VALUES EMPHASIZED	MEAN RATING	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.1	0.5

TABLE IV.22: EMPHASIS OF THE SCHOOL ON SPECIFIC STUDENT OUTCOMES

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
SCHL EMPHASIS ON COLLEGE PREP	MEAN RATING	0.8	0.8	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.8
SCHL EMPHASIS ON BASIC SKILLS	MEAN RATING	0.9	0.8	0.8	1.0	0.6	0.9
SCHL EMPHASIS ON CRITICAL THINKI	MEAN RATING	0.4	0.8	0.8	1.0	0.9	0.5
RESPECT FOR AUTHORITY EMPHASIZED	MEAN RATING	0.4	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.2	0.5
VOCATIONAL PREPARATION EMPHASIZED	MEAN RATING	0.4	0.2	0.6	0.5	0.0	0.4
SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT EMPHASIZED	MEAN RATING	0.5	0.6	0.8	1.0	0.1	0.5
SELF ESTEEM EMPHASIZED	MEAN RATING	0.6	0.8	0.8	1.0	0.3	0.6
RELIGIOUS VALUES EMPHASIZED	MEAN RATING	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.1	0.2

3. Reported Reasons for Success of the School

Tables IV.23 show the results of a question designed to determine which school features contributed to success of the school. The tables show the mean percentages of schools that attributed school success to one of the following school features: highly dedicated teachers; superior student discipline; superior course offerings; good parental involvement; good student morale; and a highly selected student body.

Not surprisingly, highly dedicated teachers was cited as an important reason for school success by the vast majority of all of the respondent schools. Averaging across all school types (see right hand column in Tables IV.23), 90% of elementary and secondary schools regarded dedicated teachers as contributing to school success. This average percentage is higher than the overall percentages of other features cited.

Again, looking in the right hand column, 'Total Returns', one can see that 80% of elementary and secondary school officials also cited 'good student morale' as a success factor. Overall, superior student discipline was a key success factor in about 60% of elementary and secondary schools, but only 50% of nonsectarian elementary and 30% of nonsectarian secondary schools regarded this factor as important. Beyond this, differences between elementary and secondary schools begin to appear. Seventy percent of elementary schools cited 'good parental involvement' as a school feature contibuting to success, compared to 50% of the schools at the secondary level. 'Superior course offerings' was a slightly more important success factor at the secondary level.

Differences between public and private schools are less pronounced than differences within the private sector. However, one such difference between public and private schools is reflected in the feature 'highly selected student body', which 80% of nonsectarian and Catholic private secondary schools regarded as important.

TABLE IV.23: REPORTED REASONS FOR THE SUCCESS OF THE SCHOOL

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
SCHL SUCCESS DUE TO DEDICATED TEACHERS	MEAN RATING	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.9
SCHL SUCCESS DUE TO STUDENT DISCIPLINE	MEAN RATING	0.6	0.7	1.0	0.8	0.5	0.6
SCHL SUCCESS DUE TO COURSE OFFERINGS	MEAN RATING	0.3	0.3	1.0	0.5	0.6	0.4
SCHL SUCCESS DUE TO PARENT INVOLVEMENT	MEAN RATING	0.6	0.8	0.0	0.6	0.8	0.7
SCHL SUCCESS DUE TO STUDENT MORALE	MEAN RATING	0.8	0.9	1.0	0.7	0.8	0.8
SCHL SUCCESS DUE TO SELECT STUDENT BODY	MEAN RATING	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.4	0.1

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
SCHL SUCCESS DUE TO DEDICATED TEACHERS	MEAN RATING	0.9	0.8	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.9
SCHL SUCCESS DUE TO STUDENT DISCIPLINE	MEAN RATING	0.5	0.8	1.0	1.0	0.3	0.6
SCHL SUCCESS DUE TO COURSE OFFERINGS	MEAN RATING	0.6	0.4	0.2	1.0	0.7	0.5
SCHL SUCCESS DUE TO PARENT INVOLVEMENT	MEAN RATING	0.5	0.6	0.8	1.0	0.3	0.5
SCHL SUCCESS DUE TO STUDENT MORALE	MEAN RATING	0.8	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.6	0.8
SCHL SUCCESS DUE TO SELECT STUDENT BODY	MEAN RATING	0.1	0.6	0.8	0.5	0.8	0.2

4. Successful School Practices

Public and private school officials were asked if any of the following specific practices contibuted to their schools' success:

a. Instructional Programs

School-wide use of a particular teaching method
School-wide use of a particular curriculum

b. Student Evaluation

School-wide review of each student's progress
Dismissal of poor students

Tables IV.24 present the results of this question. Overall, about 80% of the elementary school officials believed that both a particular curriculum and school-wide review of student progress contributed to their schools' success. This high percentage drops off a bit at the secondary level. There, overall, about 50% of the secondary school officials regarded a particular curriculum as a success factor; 70% believed student progress contributed to school success.

It is interesting to note the relatively low importance attached to a school-wide use of a particular teaching method. At the secondary level, only the public and Catholic private school officials attached any importance to this factor. As one might expect, primarily nonsectarian and other religious schools administrators cited dismissal of poor students as a success factor. At the secondary level, 100% of the nonsectarian and 50% of other religious schools beleived the practice of dismissing poor students contributed to school success.

TABLE IV.24: SCHOOL PRACTICES BELIEVED TO BE RESPONSIBLE FOR SCHOOL SUCCESS

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
SCHL SUCCESS DUE TO SELECTED TCHG METHOD	MEAN RATING	0.3	0.8	1.0	0.2	0.4	0.4
SCHL SUCCESS DUE TO SELECTED CURRICULUM	MEAN RATING	0.8	1.0	1.0	0.5	0.7	0.8
SUCCESS DUE TO REVIEW OF STDNT PROGRESS	MEAN RATING	0.8	0.9	1.0	0.7	0.7	0.8
SCHL SUCCESS DUE TO DISMISSAL POOR STUD	MEAN RATING	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.5	0.4	0.3

TABLE IV.24: SCHOOL PRACTICES BELIEVED TO BE RESPONSIBLE FOR SCHOOL SUCCESS

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
SCHL SUCCESS DUE TO SELECTED TCHG METHOD	MEAN RATING	0.3	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.3
SCHL SUCCESS DUE TO SELECTED CURRICULUM	MEAN RATING	0.5	1.0	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5
SUCCESS DUE TO REVIEW OF STDNT PROGRESS	MEAN RATING	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.6	0.7
SCHL SUCCESS DUE TO DISMISSAL POOR STUD	MEAN RATING	0.2	0.8	0.5	0.5	1.0	0.4

5. Student Uniforms

What percentage of the private schools required their students to wear uniforms? At the elementary level, 100 percent of the Catholic parochial and private, 26% of other religious and 20% of nonsectarian schools required the use of student uniforms. These percentages appear to decrease at the secondary level, except for nonsectarian secondary schools where 33% required them. This information is shown in Tables IV.25.

TABLE IV.25: STUDENTS WEAR UNIFORMS

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE								TOTAL RETURNS	
	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN			
	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM
SCHL REQUIRES UNIFORMS FOR STDNTS										
NO	0	0	0	0	14	73.7	17	81.0	31	28.4
YES	68	100.0	1	100.0	5	26.3	4	19.0	78	71.6

TABLE IV.25: STUDENTS WEAR UNIFORMS

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE								TOTAL RETURNS	
	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN			
	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM
SCHL REQUIRES UNIFORMS FOR STDNTS										
NO	5	100.0	2	40.0	2	100.0	6	66.7	15	71.4
YES	0	0	3	60.0	0	0	3	33.3	6	28.6

6. Importance of Various Teacher Attributes

We asked public and private school officials to rate on a scale of '1' to '5' , with '5' as most important, the importance of the following teacher attributes as they pertained to teacher hiring:

Masters Degree or higher;
Bachelors degree;
Previous teaching experience;
Membership in a religious order or community;
Religious or other affiliation;
Personal lifestyle;
Gender;
Race/ethnic origin (Affirmative Action);
Philosophy of education;
State Teaching Credential.

Abbreviations for these attributes are found in Tables IV.26. Shown in these tables are the mean ratings of school officials in each stratum using the scale of '1' to '5' for each of the above attributes.

Previous teaching experience and a bachelors degree were considered important factors in the hiring process by the majority of elementary and secondary schools. The mean rating for elementary schools with regard to previous teaching experience was 4.2; the mean rating with regard to the BA degree was 3.9. Public elementary and secondary schools rated having a masters degree or higher as an important criterion for hiring (mean ratings of 2.5 and 2.7 respctively) . Teacher possession of a masters degree was an important factor in the private sector primarily at the secondary level, where the mean ratings were 3.4 for nonsectarian schools and 3.3 for Catholic private schools.

There were several response patterns which we did not expect to find. First, at both the elementary and secondary levels, a teacher's philosophy of education was the attribute most consistently rated as an important hiring criteria. Overall, the mean ratings for this attribute were 4.9 for elementary and 4.3 for secondary school teachers. These overall mean ratings were slightly higher than those for previous teaching experience and a BA degree. Second, considerations of gender and race were relatively unimportant in the majority of school types, with slightly more importance attached to these at the secondary level.

Personal lifestyle was a more important factor for private schools, particularly Catholic and other religious schools. Note the mean ratings of 4.6 for Catholic parochial and 5.0 for other religious secondary schools with regard to personal lifestyle. Religious affiliation and membership in a religious order were important attributes to Catholic and other religious schools, with the exception of Catholic parochial elementary schools which did not regard membership in a religious order as important.

State certification was most important to public schools and Catholic parochial elementary schools, which had mean ratings of 4.4 for this criterion. Note how relatively unimportant state certification was to nonsectarian secondary schools. With this exception, state certification was a fairly important teacher attribute in the hiring process.

TABLE IV.26: IMPORTANCE OF VARIOUS TEACHER ATTRIBUTES

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
IMPORT OF TCHR ATTRIB=MS DEGREE	MEAN	2.5	1.9	1.0	1.8	2.2	2.1
IMPORT OF TCHR ATTRIB=BA DEGREE	MEAN	3.8	4.7	5.0	4.3	3.7	4.2
IMPORT OF TCHR ATTRIB=PREVIOUS EXPER	MEAN	4.1	3.8	5.0	3.5	4.2	3.9
IMPORT OF TCHR ATTRIB=MEMBR RELIG ORDR	MEAN	1.1	2.0	3.0	3.8	1.1	1.7
IMPORT OF TCHR ATTRIB=RELIGIOUS AFFIL	MEAN	1.1	4.2	5.0	4.4	1.4	2.8
IMPORT OF TCHR ATTRIB=PERS LIFESTYLE	MEAN	2.2	3.9	4.0	3.6	2.5	3.1
IMPORT OF TCHR ATTRIB=GENDER	MEAN	1.3	1.6	3.0	1.3	1.9	1.5
IMPORT OF TCHR ATTRIB=RACE/ETHNIC ORIGN	MEAN	1.8	2.0	3.0	1.5	2.4	1.9
IMPORT OF TCHR ATTRIB=PHIL OF EDUC	MEAN	4.4	4.9	5.0	4.8	4.7	4.7
IMPORT OF TCHR ATTRIB=STATE CERT	MEAN	4.4	4.4	5.0	2.5	2.7	4.0

TABLE IV.26: IMPORTANCE OF VARIOUS TEACHER ATTRIBUTES

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
IMPORT OF TCHR ATTRIB=MS DEGREE	MEAN	2.7	2.4	3.3	2.5	3.4	2.8
IMPORT OF TCHR ATTRIB=BA DEGREE	MEAN	4.1	4.6	3.8	4.5	4.6	4.2
IMPORT OF TCHR ATTRIB=PREVIOUS EXPER	MEAN	3.5	3.6	4.3	3.0	4.4	3.7
IMPORT OF TCHR ATTRIB=MEMBR RELIG ORDR	MEAN	1.2	1.8	3.5	5.0	1.0	1.5
IMPORT OF TCHR ATTRIB=RELIGIOUS AFFIL	MEAN	1.1	4.6	3.8	5.0	1.7	1.7
IMPORT OF TCHR ATTRIB=PERS LIFESTYLE	MEAN	2.6	4.4	3.8	5.0	3.4	3.0
IMPORT OF TCHR ATTRIB=GENDER	MEAN	1.6	2.0	2.8	1.5	1.6	1.7
IMPORT OF TCHR ATTRIB=RACE/ETHNIC ORIGN	MEAN	2.4	2.8	2.3	2.0	2.3	2.4
IMPORT OF TCHR ATTRIB=PHIL OF EDUC	MEAN	4.3	4.8	4.6	4.5	4.3	4.3
IMPORT OF TCHR ATTRIB=STATE CERT	MEAN	4.4	3.4	3.3	3.0	1.3	3.9

F. SCHOOL GOVERNANCE AND ENVIRONMENT

1. Schools with Local Governing Boards

The majority of schools reported that they had their own local governing boards (See Tables IV.27). A slightly higher percentage of secondary schools, 80% overall, reported having their own boards. Catholic schools had the lowest percentages of schools with their own local governing boards -- 60% of Catholic parochial elementary and secondary, and 60% of Catholic private secondary.

TABLE IV.27: SCHOOLS WITH LOCAL GOVERNING BOARDS

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE										TOTAL RETURNS	
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN			
	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM
SCHOL HAS LOCAL GOVERNING BOARD												
NO	7	11.5	27	40.3	1	100.0	1	5.6	4	21.1	40	24.1
YES	54	88.5	40	59.7	0	0	17	94.4	15	78.9	126	75.9

TABLE IV.27: SCHOOLS WITH LOCAL GOVERNING BOARDS

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE										TOTAL RETURNS	
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN			
	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM
SCHOL HAS LOCAL GOVERNING BOARD												
NO	11	19.6	2	40.0	2	40.0	0	0	0	0	15	19.7
YES	45	80.4	3	60.0	3	60.0	2	100.0	8	100.0	61	80.3

2. Membership of Local Governing Boards

Private schools were asked about the size and composition of their local governing boards. Other religious and nonsectarian schools reported larger boards than did Catholic schools, but slighlty lower percentages of parents of students currently enrolled in the school serving on those boards. Secondary schools, in general, had larger boards than did elementary schools. The mean number of members on local governing boards of secondary schools was 19, compared to an overall mean of 10 in elementary schools (see Tables IV. 27).

TABLE IV.28: MEMBERSHIP OF LOCAL GOVERNING BOARDS

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL
# OF MEMBERS ON LOCAL GOVERNING BOARD	MEAN	8.5	0	10.4	12.3	9.7
# OF PARENTS ON LOCAL GOVERNING BOARD	MEAN	6.4	0	5.0	7.3	6.2

TABLE IV.28: MEMBERSHIP OF LOCAL GOVERNING BOARDS

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL
# OF MEMBERS ON LOCAL GOVERNING BOARD	MEAN	11.7	10.0	27.0	22.3	18.6
# OF PARENTS ON LOCAL GOVERNING BOARD	MEAN	6.3	2.3	1.0	6.4	5.2

3. Influence of Various Constituencies on Decision-Making

We attempted to determine how much influence various school constituencies exerted on decision making in the following areas: adopting a major change in the curriculum; hiring and dismissing teachers; determining student admissions policies; and defining the school's budget. School officials were asked to rate a particular group's influence on a scale of '1' to '5', '5' being the highest. The numbers in Tables IV.29 represent the weighted mean of all elementary and secondary school types for their ratings. For example, a 4.3 for elementary school faculty in curriculum decisions would tell us that, in general, the elementary school officials perceived faculty as having a relatively strong impact on curriculum decisions.

The results are interesting. Overall, principals and local governing boards had the most influence over the decisions we studied, with mean ratings between 1.9 and 4.7. Faculty at the elementary and secondary levels had a significant impact on curriculum decisions, with ratings of 4.3 and 4.1, respectively. Faculty at the secondary level also had a fairly strong influence on hiring decisions, evidenced by an overall mean rating of 2.5. Not surprisingly, parents had very little influence on any of the decisions. The administrative system office (abbreviated SDE- ADMIN in the charts below) also had relatively little influence. The highest mean rating for this group was a 2.1 for curriculum decisions at the elementary level. The influence of the pastor or rabbi was also small, except in defining the school budget at the elementary level (mean rating of 2.6).

Appendix C.1 contains tables which provide a breakdown of these ratings by school type, allowing the reader to see the actual responses for categories of schools. No consistent public-private differences in the ratings were observed, and therefore these lengthy tables are not included here.

TABLE V.10

Influence of Various Constituencies on Decision-Making (Grade Level = Elementary)

	Curriculum	Hiring Teachers	Dismissing Teachers	Student Admissions	Budget
SDE Administration	2.1	1.3	1.5	1.8	1.6
Local Governing Board	2.6	1.9	2.4	2.6	3.3
Pastor or Rabbi	1.9	1.6	1.9	1.9	2.6
Principal/Head	4.2	4.6	4.6	3.8	4.3
Faculty	4.3	2.1	1.4	2.6	2.3
Parent Group	1.8	.9	1.1	1.1	1.3

TABLE V.11

Influence of Various Constituencies on Decision-Making (Grade Level = Secondary)

	Curriculum	Hiring Teachers	Dismissing Teachers	Student Admissions	Budget
SDE Administration	1.7	.8	1.3	1.5	1.8
Local Governing Board	3.4	2.5	3.6	3.0	3.7
Pastor or Rabbi	1.8	.8	.6	.8	1.3
Principal/Head	4.1	4.5	4.7	3.6	4.1
Faculty	4.1	2.5	1.9	2.1	1.8
Parent Group	1.6	.8	.9	.8	1.1

4. Function of the School Principal in the School

Schools were asked to designate the primary function of the principal/head from among the following choices:

a. Instructional leader of the school
b. Administrative manager, delegating instructional decisions to the teachers
c. Both instructional leader and administrative manager
d. None of the above. Other:______

As you can see in Tables IV.30, the majority of schools viewed the principal/ head as both an instructional leader and an administrative manager. For example, an average of 77% to 91% of the elementary schools viewed the principals/head as both an instructional leader and administrative manager. There was more variation in this perception at the secondary level. Only 50% of nonsectarian secondary schols viewed the head as both an instructional leader and a manager; the other half viewed the role as one of administrative manager only. Twenty percent of Catholic private secondary schools viewed the principal as an instructional leader only.

TABLE IV.30: FUNCTION OF THE SCHOOL PRINCIPAL IN THE SCHOOL

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE										TOTAL RETURNS	
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN			
	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM
FUNCTION OF THE PRINCIPAL												
INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER	3	4.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.8	4	2.3
ADMIN MANAGER	2	3.1	6	9.0	0	0	2	10.5	4	19.0	14	8.1
INSTR LDR & MANAGER	60	92.3	61	91.0	1	100.0	17	89.5	16	76.2	155	89.6

TABLE IV.30: FUNCTION OF THE SCHOOL PRINCIPAL IN THE SCHOOL

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE										TOTAL RETURNS	
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN			
	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM
FUNCTION OF THE PRINCIPAL												
INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER	5	8.5	0	0	1	20.0	0	0	0	0	6	7.7
ADMIN MANAGER	4	6.8	1	25.0	0	0	0	0	4	50.0	9	11.5
INSTR LDR & MANAGER	50	84.7	3	75.0	4	80.0	2	100.0	4	50.0	63	80.8

5. Types of Information Collected By the School

School officials were asked to enter a "1" by each of the following types of information if their school collected it on a regular basis:

1) achievement test scores;
2) number of students admitted to other institutions (e.g. prep schools and colleges);
3) systematic survey of student attitudes, satisfaction;
4) systematic surveys of parental attitudes, satisfaction;
5) systematic data on teacher performance in the classroom;
6) systematic data on teacher qualifications, credentials;
7) information on prizes, scholarships won by students.

In addition, they were asked to enter a "1" if they were required to collect this data by some public agency.

Tables IV.31 summarize the responses by showing a mean rating for each category of information and whether the collection was voluntary or required. The first striking fact about the results is that in very few instances, even for public schools, were the data collections required by a public agency. The one exception appears to be that 60% of public schools were required to collect student achievement scores. It is interesting that not even teacher performance data are consistently required of public schoools (mean rating of 40%).

Virtually all elementary and secondary school respondents collected data on student achievement test scores. Other types of information which were collected on a regular basis by all school types were: data on teacher qualifications and performance; scholarships earned and placement of graduates in secondary schools.

Catholic and public schools, although not required to do so, appear to collect data on the attitudes of their students and parents more systematiclaly than do private nonsectarian and other religious schools. Seventy percent of elementary and secondary public schools collected data on student attitudes.

TABLE IV.31: TYPES OF INFORMATION COLLECTED BY THE SCHOOL ON A REGULAR BASIS

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
SCHOOL COLLECTS STDNT ACHIEV TST SCORES	MEAN RATING	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
SCHL REQRD CLCT STDNT ACHIEV SCORES	MEAN RATING	0.6	0.3	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
SCHL COLLECTS GRAD PLACEMENTS	MEAN RATING	0.2	0.8	0.0	0.6	0.5	0.5
SCHL REQRD COLLECT GRAD PLACEMENTS	MEAN RATING	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1
SCHL COLLECTS DATA ON STDNT ATTITUDES	MEAN RATING	0.7	0.4	1.0	0.3	0.2	0.5
SCHL REQRD COLLECT DATA STDNT ATTITUDES	MEAN RATING	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1
SCHL COLLECT PARENT ATTITUDE DATA	MEAN RATING	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.7
SCHL REQRD COLLECT PARENT ATTITUDE DATA	MEAN RATING	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.2
SCHL COLLECT TEACHER PERFRMANCE DATA	MEAN RATING	0.8	1.0	1.0	0.6	0.6	0.8
SCHL REQRD COLLECT TCHR PERFROM DATA	MEAN RATING	0.4	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
SCHL COLLECT TEACHER QUAL DATA	MEAN RATING	0.5	0.9	1.0	0.7	0.6	0.7
SCHL REQRD COLLECT TCHR QUAL DATA	MEAN RATING	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
SCHL COLLECT STDNT SCHOLARSHIP DATA	MEAN RATING	0.2	0.6	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.4
SCHL REQRD COLLECT STDNT SCHLSHIP DATA	MEAN RATING	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

TABLE IV.31: TYPES OF INFORMATION COLLECTED BY THE SCHOOL ON A REGULAR BASIS

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
SCHOOL COLLECTS STDNT ACHIEV TST SCORES	MEAN RATING	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.9
SCHL REQRD CLCT STDNT ACHIEV SCORES	MEAN RATING	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.4
SCHL COLLECTS GRAD PLACEMENTS	MEAN RATING	0.7	1.0	0.8	1.0	0.8	0.7
SCHL REQRD COLLECT GRAD PLACEMENTS	MEAN RATING	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
SCHL COLLECTS DATA ON STDNT ATTITUDES	MEAN RATING	0.8	0.6	1.0	0.0	0.4	0.7
SCHL REQRD COLLECT DATA STDNT ATTITUDES	MEAN RATING	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1
SCHL COLLECT PARENT ATTITUDE DATA	MEAN RATING	0.7	0.6	1.0	0.0	0.1	0.6
SCHL REQRD COLLECT PARENT ATTITUDE DATA	MEAN RATING	0.2	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.2
SCHL COLLECT TEACHER PERFRMANCE DATA	MEAN RATING	0.8	1.0	1.0	0.5	0.6	0.8
SCHL REQRD COLLECT TCHR PERFROM DATA	MEAN RATING	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.3
SCHL COLLECT TEACHER QUAL DATA	MEAN RATING	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.8	0.7
SCHL REQRD COLLECT TCHR QUAL DATA	MEAN RATING	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.3
SCHL COLLECT STDNT SCHOLARSHIP DATA	MEAN RATING	0.8	1.0	0.8	1.0	0.9	0.8
SCHL REQRD COLLECT STDNT SCHLSHIP DATA	MEAN RATING	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1

6. Dissemination of Information

Both public and private school officials were asked how information about the school and its program priorities were communicated to interested parties outside the school. The results of the question are not surprising; most of the respondents presented information about the school through brochures, advertising, public presentations by school administrators , and reliance on school reputation.

Secondary school officials also reported making regular visits to feeder schools or supporting organizations. Church schools used church publications as a dissemination vehicle. Public schools appeared to rely less on advertising -- only 30% to 40% listed this, compared to 50% to 100% of the private schools. Only the Catholic parochial schools reported much use of public relations specialists.

Tables IV.32 present this information. The fractions in the tables represent the mean percentages of school officials who placed a "1" in the categories representing the channels by which they disseminated information about their schools.

TABLE IV.32: WAYS IN WHICH INFORMATION IS MADE AVAILABLE ABOUT THE SCHOOL

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
INFO ON SCHL AVAIL BY BROCHURE	MEAN RATING	0.9	1.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.9
INFO ON SCHL AVAIL BY ADVERTIZING	MEAN RATING	0.3	0.9	0.0	0.7	0.5	0.5
INFO ON SCHL THRU PRESENTATIONS	MEAN RATING	0.8	0.9	1.0	0.3	0.5	0.7
INFO ON SCHL THRU VISITS	MEAN RATING	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.3	0.3
INFO FROM PUBLIC RELATION SPECIALIST	MEAN RATING	0.1	0.5	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1
INFO FROM SCHOOL REPUTATION	MEAN RATING	0.8	1.0	1.0	0.9	1.0	0.9
INFO FROM PRIVATE CHURCH PUBLICATIONS	MEAN RATING	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.7	0.1	0.4

TABLE IV.32: WAYS IN WHICH INFORMATION IS MADE AVAILABLE ABOUT THE SCHOOL

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL RETURNS
INFO ON SCHL AVAIL BY BROCHURE	MEAN RATING	0.8	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.9
INFO ON SCHL AVAIL BY ADVERTIZING	MEAN RATING	0.4	1.0	0.5	1.0	0.6	0.5
INFO ON SCHL THRU PRESENTATIONS	MEAN RATING	0.8	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.7	0.8
INFO ON SCHL THRU VISITS	MEAN RATING	0.8	0.8	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.9
INFO FROM PUBLIC RELATION SPECIALIST	MEAN RATING	0.2	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2
INFO FROM SCHOOL REPUTATION	MEAN RATING	0.8	0.8	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.8
INFO FROM PRIVATE CHURCH PUBLICATIONS	MEAN RATING	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.1	0.2

7. School Accreditation

Tables IV.33 present the percentages of schools in each category which are accredited by an outside organization. The questionnaires listed the following outside accrediting organizations as possible choices: California Association of Independent Schools, Western Association of Schools and Colleges; Western Catholic Education Association; General Conference of Seventh-Day Adventists; and Montessori Associations International.

At the elementary level, 4% of public, 78% of Catholic parochial, 33% of other religious and 65% of nonsectarian were accredited. These percentages increase dramatically at the secondary level. Here, 100% of Catholic parochial, private, other religious, and nonsectarian, and 88% of public schools were accredited by outside organizations.

TABLE IV.33: SCHOOL ACCREDITATION

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE										TOTAL RETURNS	
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN			
	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM
SCH ACCREDITED BY OUTSIDE ORGANIZATION												
NO	50	96.2	14	22.2	0	0	12	66.7	7	35.0	83	53.9
YES	2	3.8	49	77.8	1	100.0	6	33.3	13	65.0	71	46.1

TABLE IV.33: SCHOOL ACCREDITATION

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE										TOTAL RETURNS	
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN			
	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM	N	% OF STRATUM
SCH ACCREDITED BY OUTSIDE ORGANIZATION												
NO	7	12.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	9.1
YES	51	87.9	5	100.0	3	100.0	2	100.0	9	100.0	70	90.9

G. GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

One of the most common perceptions about private schools is that they function completely independently from government programs, except perhaps the program granting tax-exempt status to non-proprietary private schools. As part of our survey of private schools, we asked school officials about the extent of their schools' participation in any publicly funded programs involving local, state or federal agencies, including dual enrollment programs in public colleges and schools. A small percent of the schools that responded said they did participate in a publicly funded program. This next series of tables will present the nature and extent of that involvement.

We would like to note that the response rate for these qestions was particularly low, and therefore the information contained in these tables is by no means comprehensive. We present it because the data suggest patterns of private school participation in publicly funded programs which should be further explored.

1. Student Participation in Local Public Programs

Tables IV.34 show the mean numbers of private school students participating in the following local publicly funded programs: dual enrollment in public college or K-12 classes, vocational education classes, public transportation and on-site health and welfare services. The numbers of students involved in any of these programs is, in general, quite low. There is some degree of participation in onsite health and welfare services at the elementary level for Catholic and other religious schools -- an average of 16 and 13 students, respectively. An average of 60 Catholic parochial secondary school students participated in public school classes.

TABLE IV.34: NUMBER OF STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN DESIGNATED PUBLIC PROGRAMS

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL
# OF STDNTS IN COLLEGE CLASSES	MEAN	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
# OF STDNTS IN VOC ED CLASSES	MEAN	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0
# OF STDNTS IN PUBLIC SCHOOL CLASSES	MEAN	3.5	12.0	0.0	0.2	2.4
# OF STDNTS USING PUBLIC TRANSPORT	MEAN	3.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	2.6
# OF STDNTS ONSITE HEALTH WELFARE SERV	MEAN	15.6	4.0	13.1	0.0	11.9

TABLE IV.34: NUMBER OF STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN DESIGNATED PUBLIC PROGRAMS

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL
# OF STDNTS IN COLLEGE CLASSES	MEAN	5.2	0.0	0.0	1.6	2.2
# OF STDNTS IN VOC ED CLASSES	MEAN	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
# OF STDNTS IN PUBLIC SCHOOL CLASSES	MEAN	60.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.9
# OF STDNTS USING PUBLIC TRANSPORT	MEAN	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
# OF STDNTS ONSITE HEALTH WELFARE SERV	MEAN	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

2. School Participation in Specific Federal Programs

Tables IV.35 show the percentages of schools in each school stratum which did or did not participate in three federally funded programs: 1) federal child nutrition program, including school breakfast, milk or lunch program; 2) school library materials program (former ESEA Title IV-B); 3) School district desegregation (former ESAA). Only 10 percent of nonsectarian schools that responded received funding for the nutrition programs. Other religious elementary, and nonsectarian elementary and secondary schools received some funds for library materials. None of the respondent private schools received funding for desegregation.

TABLE IV.35: SCHOOL PARTICIPATION IN SPECIFIC FEDERAL PROGRAMS

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE						TOTAL	
	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN			
	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN
SCHL IN FED NUTRITION PROGRAM								
NO	1	100.0	16	100.0	18	90.0	35	94.6
YES	0	0	0	0	2	10.0	2	5.4
SCHL RECEIVES FUNDS FOR LIB MATERIALS								
NO	1	100.0	12	75.0	14	70.0	27	73.0
YES	0	0	4	25.0	6	30.0	10	27.0
SCHL RECEIVES DESEGREGATION FUNDS								
NO	1	100.0	16	100.0	20	100.0	37	100.0

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				TOTAL	
	OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN			
	N	PCTN	N	PCTN	N	PCTN
SCHL IN FED NUTRITION PROGRAM						
NO	2	100.0	7	87.5	9	90.0
YES	0	0	1	12.5	1	10.0
SCHL RECEIVES FUNDS FOR LIB MATERIALS						
NO	2	100.0	6	75.0	8	80.0
YES	0	0	2	25.0	2	20.0
SCHL RECEIVES DESEGREGATION FUNDS						
NO	2	100.0	8	100.0	10	100.0

3. Participation in Programs for Special Needs Populations

Schools were asked to estimate how many students currently enrolled in their schools participated in the following federal programs: compensatory education (former ESEA-Title I); Bilingual Education (ESEA Title VII); Handicapped Education (PL 94-142). In Tables IV.36, only Catholic parochial and private schools had a significant number of students participating in the federal compensatory education program. Participation in the other programs described above was virtually nonexistent.

TABLE IV.36: NUMBER OF STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN FEDERAL AND/OR STATE PROGRAMS FOR SPECIAL NEED POPULATIONS

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL
ENR PARTICIPATING IN FED COMP ED PROG	MEAN	62.5	57.1	110.0	2.7	0.0	47.5
ENR PARTICIPATING IN FED BILNGL PROG	MEAN	14.6	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.7
ENR PARTICIPATING IN FED SPEC EDUC PRG	MEAN	15.7	0.2	0.0	0.0	2.8	6.5
ENR PARTICIPATING IN STATE SPEC ED PRG	MEAN	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.6

TABLE IV.36: NUMBER OF STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN FEDERAL AND/OR STATE PROGRAMS FOR SPECIAL NEED POPULATIONS

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL
ENR PARTICIPATING IN FED COMP ED PROG	MEAN	148.2	77.5	28.0	0.0	0.0	116.7
ENR PARTICIPATING IN FED BILNGL PROG	MEAN	42.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	32.1
ENR PARTICIPATING IN FED SPEC EDUC PRG	MEAN	28.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.2
ENR PARTICIPATING IN STATE SPEC ED PRG	MEAN	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

4. Administrative Time Spent on Publicly funded Programs

Nonsectarian and other religious school officials spend little to no time administering publicly funded programs. This is not surprising, for both of these types of schools reported minimal participation in any publicly funded programs. On the other hand, about 60% of public school officials and 40% of Catholic school administrators reported spending a fair amount of time to a great deal of time administering such programs. These percentages are contained in Tables IV.37.

TABLE IV.37: ADMINISTRATIVE TIME SPENT ON PUBLICLY FUNDED PROGRAMS

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE											
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN		TOTAL	
	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM
EST ADMIN TIME ON PUB FUNDED PROGRMS												
GREAT DEAL OF TIME	12	17.6	1	2.0	0	0	0	0	1	14.3	14	10.7
A LOT OF TIME	8	11.8	6	12.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	10.7
FAIR AMOUNT OF TIME	24	35.3	22	44.9	1	100.0	0	0	1	14.3	48	36.6
SOME TIME	15	22.1	8	16.3	0	0	2	33.3	1	14.3	26	19.8
ALMOST NO TIME	9	13.2	12	24.5	0	0	4	66.7	4	57.1	29	22.1

TABLE IV.37: ADMINISTRATIVE TIME SPENT ON PUBLICLY FUNDED PROGRAMS

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		NON-SECTARIAN		TOTAL	
	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM	N	% OF STRAT-UM
EST ADMIN TIME ON PUB FUNDED PROGRMS										
GREAT DEAL OF TIME	8	13.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	11.6
A LOT OF TIME	5	8.3	1	25.0	0	0	0	0	6	8.7
FAIR AMOUNT OF TIME	22	36.7	1	25.0	1	50.0	0	0	24	34.8
SOME TIME	11	18.3	2	50.0	0	0	0	0	13	18.8
ALMOST NO TIME	14	23.3	0	0	1	50.0	3	100.0	18	26.1

5. Perception of Coordination of Publicly Funded Programs

School officials were asked to rank on a scale of '1' to '5', with '5' being the highest, the degree of integration and coordination of the administrative and reporting requirements of the public programs in which their school or students participated. Most elementary schools rated state and federal cooordination as slightly above average -- 3.0 to 3.5. Secondary schools were harsher critics, particularly nonsectarian schools which rated state program integration as poor. Public secondary schools rated the coordination of state and federal programs as just below average, 2.6 to 2.8. See Tables IV.38 for these ratings.

TABLE IV.38: PERCEPTION OF COORDINATION AND INTEGRATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR PUBLICLY FUNDED PROGRAMS

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL
COORDINATION OF STATE PROGRAMS	MEAN RATING	3.5	3.0	3.0	0	3.0	3.4
COORDINATION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS	MEAN RATING	3.4	3.5	3.0	5.0	3.0	3.5
COORDINATION OF STATE AND FED PROGRMS	MEAN RATING	3.2	3.0	2.0	0	3.0	3.1

TABLE IV.38: PERCEPTION OF COORDINATION AND INTEGRATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR PUBLICLY FUNDED PROGRAMS

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL
COORDINATION OF STATE PROGRAMS	MEAN RATING	2.8	2.5	4.0	0	1.0	2.8
COORDINATION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS	MEAN RATING	2.6	3.3	0	0	3.0	2.7
COORDINATION OF STATE AND FED PROGRMS	MEAN RATING	2.7	2.5	0	0	1.0	2.6

H. SCHOOL FINANCE AND BUDGETS

Some of the more interesting comparisons between public and private schools revolve around questions of school finance and budgeting. How do per pupil revenues and expenditures differ between public and private schools? Which types of schools appear to be the most cost effective?

Athough financial data for schools is some of the most interesting data to study, it is extremely difficult to collect with accuracy. This is due to several reasons. First, financial reporting varies from school to school. Some schools automatically include fees in their stated tuition prices, others do not. Also, there are differences in accounting practices, in particular the grouping of expenses and revenues into various categories. Eventhough we asked for very specific categories in our questonnaire (for example, INSTRUCTIONAL EXPENSES -- SALARY AND BENEFITS), we suspect many schools had difficulty extracting the very specific data we requeseted fom their finanical statements.

As a result, response rates for the questions regarding revenues and expenses were particularly low, and we are not confident about the consistency of the data. For some school types, data on expenditures and revenues were taken from sources other than the IFG questionnaires (e.g., state reports and Diocesan data sources). Often these data were reported in forms which were not compatible and this limited our ability to compare. As much as we would like to compare per pupil revenues and expenditures between all school types, we were able to do so only for nonsectarian and other religious schools for which we had more complete data. We do have some data on private school tuition and financial aid, and transportation services provided for all private school types. Readers who wish to pursue research using expenditures and revenues, are advised that we have collected data on these two topics from all school types, but further work with the data is required to eliminate some of the inconsistencies.

1. Tuition Charges for Private Schools

Tables IV.39 show the mean tuition charges for the various types of private schools at both the elementary and secondary levels. At the elementary level, nonsectarian and other religious schools are more expensive than the Catholic schools. For example, nonsectarian elementary schools, which charged on average $1900 to $2500, were about three times more expensive than the Catholic schools, which charged between $300 and $675.

Tuition for all school types increased considerably at the secondary level. Nonsectarian and Catholic parochial secondary schools were about twice as expensive as their elementary school counterparts. Tuition charges in nonsectarian schools were $3600- $3900, depending on the student's grade level. Note the increase in Catholic private school tuition from $600 in the one elementary school to $2097 at the secondary level, making it the second most expensive type of school at the secondary level.

Tuition rates for the second child from the same family were, in many cases, slightly lower than those for the first child. Generally, these differences in tuition were between $40 and $300.

TABLE IV.39: TUITION CHARGES FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL
LOWEST GRADE TUITION FIRST CHILD	MEAN	674.1	600.0	1032.5	2030.3	989.2
LOWEST GRADE TUITION SECOND CHILD	MEAN	674.1	300.0	905.2	1904.9	1307.4
HIGHEST GRADE TUITION FIRST CHILD	MEAN	674.1	600.0	1320.7	2593.2	1144.9
HIGHEST GRADE TUITION SECOND CHILD	MEAN	674.1	300.0	1167.0	2375.1	1634.2

TABLE IV.39: TUITION CHARGES FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL
LOWEST GRADE TUITION FIRST CHILD	MEAN	1347.0	1246.3	1560.0	3757.8	2433.0
LOWEST GRADE TUITION SECOND CHILD	MEAN	1347.0	1246.3	1380.0	3612.9	3116.7
HIGHEST GRADE TUITION FIRST CHILD	MEAN	1353.0	1737.0	1560.0	3971.1	2586.2
HIGHEST GRADE TUITION SECOND CHILD	MEAN	1353.0	1246.3	1380.0	3784.3	3250.0

2. Financial Aid Provided to Students

In general, the vast majority of students enrolled in private schools paid full tuition -- an average of 75% to 90%. At both the elementary and secondary levels, nonsectarian and Catholic private schools had the greatest percentages of students receiving partial tuition. About 80% of the students in nonsectarian, 75% in Catholic elementary and 85% in Catholic private secondary schools paid full tuition. A higher percentage of nonsectarian students, although still quite a small percentage (3% for secondary students) received full scholarships. This information is displayed in Tables IV.40.

TABLE IV.40: FINANCIAL AID PROVIDED TO STUDENTS

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL
% ENR PAYING FULL TUITION	MEAN	90.9	75.0	89.2	83.3	89.3
% ENR PAYING PARTIAL TUITION	MEAN	8.5	25.0	10.4	15.2	10.0
% ENR PAYING NO TUITION (FULL SCHLRSHP)	MEAN	0.6	0.0	0.4	1.5	0.7

TABLE IV.40: FINANCIAL AID PROVIDED TO STUDENTS

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL
% ENR PAYING FULL TUITION	MEAN	86.9	85.7	88.1	80.4	84.1
% ENR PAYING PARTIAL TUITION	MEAN	12.4	13.1	10.9	16.6	14.1
% ENR PAYING NO TUITION (FULL SCHLRSHP)	MEAN	0.7	1.1	1.1	2.9	1.7

3. Total Revenue Per Pupil

As previously mentioned, accurate data on revenues, expenses and enrollments were difficult to obtain from schools. Data obtained from public and Catholic schools were inconsistent and therefore are not presented in tables IV.41 below. These tables show the total revenue per pupil for the other religious and nonsectarian schools. The numbers for the tables were derived in the following manner:

- Total tuition and fees/ enrollment;
- Total parish or church contributions/ enrollment;
- Total revenue from individual or corporate donations and investment and endowment income/ enrollment;
- Total revenue from other sources/ enrollment;
- Total revenue;
- Percent of total revenue from tuition and fees;
- Percent of total revenue obtained from church or diocese subsidies;
- Percent of revenue from gifts, contributions investments and endowment;
- Percent of revenue from other sources;

All figures are for the year 1981-82.

It is interesting to note that for nonsectarian schools, tuition and fees made up 91% of total reveunue at the elementary level, and only 79% at the secondary level. The difference between total revenue and tuition in these nonsectarian schools was made up primarily by revenue from individal and corporate donations and investment and endowment income . About 80% of other religious elementary and secondary schools' revenues came from tuition and fees. In the other religious schools, church subsidies were an important factor in reducing the gap between tuition income and total revenue, particularly at the elementary level, where 16% of revenue came from this source.

TABLE IV.41: TOTAL REVENUE PER PUPIL

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE		
		OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL
TOT REV/ENR,TUITION & FEES, 81-82	MEAN	1012.0	2399.7	1777.6
TOT REV/ENR,CHURCH-DIOC SUBSIDIES,81-82	MEAN	167.0	0.0	78.0
TOT REV/ENR,GIFTS,CONTR,INVEST,-ENDOW,81-	MEAN	64.1	181.8	126.9
TOT REV/ENR,OTHER SOURCES,81-82	MEAN	14.5	82.1	51.8
TOTAL REVENUE,81-82	MEAN	300198.8	526082.4	420670.0
PCT REVENUE FROM TUITION & FEES, 81-82	MEAN	78.7	90.8	85.3
PCT REV,CHURCH-DIOC SUBSIDIES,81-82	MEAN	16.3	0.0	7.3
PCT REV,GIFTS,CONTR,INVEST,ENDO-W,81-82	MEAN	4.1	6.2	5.3
PCT REV,OTHER SOURCES,81-82	MEAN	1.0	3.0	2.1

TABLE IV.41: TOTAL REVENUE PER PUPIL

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE		
		OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL
TOT REV/ENR,TUITION & FEES, 81-82	MEAN	1538.6	3152.4	2691.3
TOT REV/ENR,CHURCH-DIOC SUBSIDIES,81-82	MEAN	212.2	0.0	60.6
TOT REV/ENR,GIFTS,CONTR,INVEST,-ENDOW,81-	MEAN	264.7	765.7	622.5
TOT REV/ENR,OTHER SOURCES,81-82	MEAN	41.2	83.4	71.4
TOTAL REVENUE,81-82	MEAN	387294.0	1048930.0	859926.9
PCT REVENUE FROM TUITION & FEES, 81-82	MEAN	79.2	78.8	78.9
PCT REV,CHURCH-DIOC SUBSIDIES,81-82	MEAN	7.8	0.0	2.2
PCT REV,GIFTS,CONTR,INVEST,ENDO-W,81-82	MEAN	10.1	19.3	16.6
PCT REV,OTHER SOURCES,81-82	MEAN	3.0	2.0	2.3

V. PERSONNEL TABLES

A. INTRODUCTION

Are public school teachers' salaries higher than those for private school teachers? Do more teachers and principals in the public sector have masters or doctorate degrees? If given a choice, would teachers and principals choose the field of education again? How do teachers and principals in the different sectors perceive discipline problems in their schoools? In which sectors do teachers work more days, teach more hours per week, teach more students, have better access to instructional materials and have more assistance from teachers aides?

These and other questions are illuminated by information in the following six areas which was obtained from public and private school teachers and principals through extensive questionnaires:

1) Educational preparation
2) Background information
3) Attitudes toward the profession
4) Employment Information
5) Terms and Conditions of Employment
6) Compensation

Copies of the four questionnaires used to obtain the information are presented in Appendix A.

Readers are reminded that response rates for several school categories were quite low, and therefore any comparisons drawn with these sectors are limited. Only two Catholic private elementary school teachers, and one other religious secondary principal responded. There were no repondents among Catholic private elementary principals.

Descriptions of the variables in the personnel file, accompanied by tables, are presented in the following sections.

B. EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION

The quality of educational preparation of school personnel may be an important determinant of the quality of teaching and administration in a particular school. Are public and private school personnel prepared equally for their occupations? Furthermore do secondary school personnel have a higher level of education than elementary school personnel. What are the differences, if any, between the educational preparation of principals and teachers? Our personnel questionnaires were designed to look at these differences in educational preparation.

1. Highest Degree Received

a. Teachers

Secondary school teachers in both public and private sectors obtained higher degrees than elementary school teachers (see Tables V.1A). For example, 52% of the public secondary school teachers received a masters degree compared to 36% of elementary public school teachers. Between 40% and 57% of private secondary school teachers held masters degrees, whereas only 14 to 33% (excluding Catholic Private which had only two respondents) of private elementary teachers had obtained a comparable level of education.

In addition to these differences between elementary and secondary levels, there are interesting differences between teachers by school types. For example, public and nonsectarian private schools had higher percentages of teachers receiving degrees beyond the BA than teachers in other school categories at comparable levels. At the secondary level, 61% of public and 73% of nonsectarian school teachers held masters, specialist, 6 year certificate or doctoral degrees, compared to a maximum of 59% for the other private school categories. At the elementary level, 52% of public and 35% of nonsectarian private teachers received a degree beyond the BA, compared to 23% and 26% for Catholic parochial and other religious. Note that at the elementary level, public school teachers had the most educational preparation. However, at the secondary level, nonsectarian school teachers had the most educational preparation including the highest percentage (10%) of teachers with doctorate degrees.

It should be noted that a few teachers at both elementary and secondary levels did not have BA degrees.

TABLE V.1A: HIGHEST DEGREE ATTAINED FOR TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
HIGHEST COLLEGE DEGREE										
NO COLLEGE DEGREE	1	0.4	4	2.5	0	0	0	0	2	5.0
ASSOCIATE DEGREE	0	0	1	0.6	0	0	1	2.9	0	0
BACHELORS DEGREE	123	48.2	117	74.1	1	50.0	25	71.4	24	60.0
MASTERS DEGREE	91	35.7	24	15.2	1	50.0	5	14.3	13	32.5
SPECIALIST 6 YEAR CERT	33	12.9	12	7.6	0	0	3	8.6	1	2.5
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION	4	1.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER DOCTORATE	2	0.8	0	0	0	0	1	2.9	0	0
NO RESPONSE	1	0.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE V.1A: HIGHEST DEGREE ATTAINED FOR TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
HIGHEST COLLEGE DEGREE										
NO COLLEGE DEGREE	1	0.5	0	0	2	1.3	1	10.0	0	0
BACHELORS DEGREE	82	38.9	27	41.5	70	44.3	4	40.0	28	26.9
MASTERS DEGREE	110	52.1	30	46.2	75	47.5	4	40.0	59	56.7
SPECIALIST 6 YEAR CERT	16	7.6	7	10.8	9	5.7	0	0	7	6.7
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION	2	0.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.0
OTHER DOCTORATE	0	0	1	1.5	2	1.3	0	0	9	8.7
NO RESPONSE	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10.0	0	0
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

b. Principals

For each category of school, principals in both public and private sectors obtained higher degrees than teachers. As in the case of teachers, private secondary school administrators obtained higher educational degrees than did those in elementary schools. Between 85% and 100% of private secondary principals had masters degrees or higher, compared to 72%-77% of their elementary school counterparts. Interestingly, the percentage of public school principals receiving a degree beyond the BA were almost identical for elementary (94%) and secondary (93%) school levels. A higher percentage of nonsectarian administrators (33% elementary, and 10% secondary) reported receiving a doctorate degree in a field other than education.

TABLE V.18: HIGHEST DEGREE ATTAINED FOR PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
HIGHEST COLLEGE DEGREE								
BACHELORS DEGREE	4	4.0	15	27.3	5	26.3	4	22.2
MASTERS DEGREE	84	84.8	29	52.7	12	63.2	5	27.8
SPECIALIST 6 YEAR CERT	3	3.0	6	10.9	2	10.5	2	11.1
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION	4	4.0	3	5.5	0	0	1	5.6
OTHER DOCTORATE	2	2.0	2	3.6	0	0	6	33.3
NO RESPONSE	2	2.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0

TABLE V.18: HIGHEST DEGREE ATTAINED FOR PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
HIGHEST COLLEGE DEGREE										
BACHELORS DEGREE	3	4.8	0	0	1	14.3	0	0	1	10.0
MASTERS DEGREE	46	73.0	5	83.3	4	57.1	1	100.0	6	60.0
SPECIALIST 6 YEAR CERT	2	3.2	1	16.7	2	28.6	0	0	2	20.0
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION	7	11.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER DOCTORATE	4	6.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10.0
NO RESPONSE	1	1.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0

2.Graduate Hours Taken for Credit beyond BA

Although Catholic parochial, Catholic private, and other religious elementary schools had the lowest percentage of teachers receiving degrees beyond the BA, they did report relatively high percentages in the 0-15, 16-30, and 31-45 graduate semester hours categories in Tables V.2A. This indicates that teachers in these three sectors had some graduate experience even though they did not obtain masters degrees. The large percentage of nonsectarian school teachers in these same graduate hours categories is a bit puzzling. Based on the large percentage of nonsectarian school teachers who received degrees beyond the BA, we would expect that a much higher percentage of these teachers would have graduate hours in the 61+ range. Actually, about 20% of the nonsectarian school teachers reported having completed 61+ semester hours, compared to about 67% of public school teachers .

Public school principals reported more graduate hours in the 61+ range than did private school principals. Seventy-seven percent of public elementary and 75% of public secondary school principals completed 61 or more semester hours. Principals had in general completed more coursework and more degrees than teachers.

TABLE V.2A: GRADUATE HOURS TAKEN FOR CREDIT BY TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SEMESTER HRS COL CREDIT BEYOND BA DEGREE										
0-15	17	6.7	59	37.3	0	0	18	51.4	15	37.5
16-30	11	4.3	22	13.9	1	50.0	5	14.3	9	22.5
31-45	24	9.4	44	27.8	1	50.0	7	20.0	6	15.0
46-60	30	11.8	16	10.1	0	0	2	5.7	4	10.0
61+	173	67.8	17	10.8	0	0	3	8.6	6	15.0
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE V.2A: GRADUATE HOURS TAKEN FOR CREDIT BY TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SEMESTER HRS COL CREDIT BEYOND BA DEGREE										
0-15	12	5.7	8	12.3	28	17.7	6	60.0	35	33.7
16-30	10	4.7	10	15.4	21	13.3	0	0	18	17.3
31-45	21	10.0	12	18.5	33	20.9	2	20.0	15	14.4
46-60	26	12.3	9	13.8	39	24.7	2	20.0	15	14.4
61+	142	67.3	26	40.0	37	23.4	0	0	21	20.2
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

TABLE V.2B: GRADUATE HOURS TAKEN FOR CREDIT BY PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SEMESTER HRS COL CREDIT BEYOND BA DEGREE								
0-15	6	6.1	12	21.8	4	21.1	7	38.9
16-30	0	0	9	16.4	3	15.8	0	0
31-45	4	4.0	10	18.2	2	10.5	3	16.7
46-60	13	13.1	6	10.9	5	26.3	2	11.1
61+	76	76.8	18	32.7	5	26.3	6	33.3
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0

TABLE V.2B: GRADUATE HOURS TAKEN FOR CREDIT BY PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SEMESTER HRS COL CREDIT BEYOND BA DEGREE										
0-15	4	6.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	50.0
16-30	1	1.6	0	0	1	14.3	0	0	0	0
31-45	2	3.2	0	0	2	28.6	0	0	0	0
46-60	2	3.2	1	16.7	0	0	0	0	2	20.0
61+	54	85.7	5	83.3	4	57.1	1	100.0	3	30.0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0

3.Recency of Degrees

In general, public school teachers and principals received their BA and subsequent degrees earlier than did personnel in the private sectors (see Tables V.3A-B). The mean year in which public elementary and secondary school teachers received their BA was 1962; the mean years for public elementary and secondary school principals were 1956 and 1955, respectively. In contrast, the mean years in which private school teachers received their BA degrees were between 1966 and 1978. For principals in these private schools, the mean years were slightly earlier, ranging from 1956 to 1963.

Mean years in which teachers and principals were awarded their highest degrees reveal a similar pattern -- public school teachers and principals received them earlier. However, there is little difference between sectors for the average year that the last college class was taken. Teachers and principals in both elementary and secondary schools, with the exception of non-sectarian secondary school principals, reported that their last college class was taken between 1974 and 1981.

It is interesting, but not very surprising that principals in every category of school received, on average, their degrees earlier than did teachers in those same categories. One would assume that principals are in general older than teachers.

TABLE V.3A: RECENCY OF DEGREES RECEIVED BY TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
YEAR BA DEGREE AWARDED	MEAN	1962	1970	1977	1970	1966
YEAR HIGHEST DEGREE AWARDED	MEAN	1969	1974	1980	1975	1970
YEAR LAST COLLEGE CLASS TAKEN	MEAN	1980	1979	1980	1978	1978

TABLE V.3A: RECENCY OF DEGREES RECEIVED BY TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
YEAR BA DEGREE AWARDED	MEAN	1963	1967	1968	1978	1968
YEAR HIGHEST DEGREE AWARDED	MEAN	1970	1973	1973	1980	1973
YEAR LAST COLLEGE CLASS TAKEN	MEAN	1978	1979	1980	1980	1977

TABLE V.3B: RECENCY OF DEGREES RECEIVED BY PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE			
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
YEAR BA DEGREE AWARDED	MEAN	1957	1963	1963	1962
YEAR HIGHEST DEGREE AWARDED	MEAN	1967	1973	1971	1976
YEAR LAST COLLEGE CLASS TAKEN	MEAN	1976	1980	1978	1977

TABLE V.3B: RECENCY OF DEGREES RECEIVED BY PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
YEAR BA DEGREE AWARDED	MEAN	1955	1963	1959	1961	1956
YEAR HIGHEST DEGREE AWARDED	MEAN	1965	1970	1971	1967	1961
YEAR LAST COLLEGE CLASS TAKEN	MEAN	1974	1979	1981	1979	1970

4.Teaching Certificates

Schools in the public sector had the highest portion of teachers and principals holding a permanent California teaching certificate, percentages all being in the 90% and over category. Catholic parochial and Catholic private schools also had a high portion of staff having instate teaching certificates -- about 75%. Smaller percentages of teachers and principals (20%-68%) in the other religious and nonsectarian categories held California teaching certificates. The largest percentages of out of state teaching certificates were held by 38% of other religious and nonsectarian elementary school teachers and 44% of nonsectarian elementary school principals.

For all sectors, except secondary school teachers in the other religious category, a greater portion of the school teachers and principals held permanent California teaching certificates than out of state teaching certificates

TABLE V.4A: TEACHING BACKGROUND OF TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
HAVE PERMANENT CALIF CERT										
NO	18	7.1	37	23.4	0	0	18	51.4	14	35.0
YES	237	92.9	120	75.9	2	100.0	16	45.7	25	62.5
NO RESPONSE	0	0	1	0.6	0	0	1	2.9	1	2.5
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0
CERTIFIED IN OTHER STATE										
NO	184	72.2	127	80.4	2	100.0	20	57.1	24	60.0
YES	65	25.5	28	17.7	0	0	13	37.1	15	37.5
NO RESPONSE	6	2.4	3	1.9	0	0	2	5.7	1	2.5
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE V.4A: TEACHING BACKGROUND OF TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
HAVE PERMANENT CALIF CERT										
NO	11	5.2	18	27.7	38	24.1	8	80.0	49	47.1
YES	199	94.3	47	72.3	119	75.3	2	20.0	53	51.0
NO RESPONSE	1	0.5	0	0	1	0.6	0	0	2	1.9
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0
CERTIFIED IN OTHER STATE										
NO	167	79.1	48	73.8	119	75.3	7	70.0	84	80.8
YES	38	18.0	16	24.6	32	20.3	3	30.0	17	16.3
NO RESPONSE	6	2.8	1	1.5	7	4.4	0	0	3	2.9
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

TABLE V.4B: TEACHING BACKGROUND OF PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
HAVE PERMANENT CALIF CERT								
NO	5	5.1	10	18.2	6	31.6	9	50.0
YES	93	93.9	45	81.8	13	68.4	9	50.0
NO RESPONSE	1	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0
CERTIFIED IN OTHER STATE								
NO	74	74.7	34	61.8	13	68.4	10	55.6
YES	21	21.2	18	32.7	6	31.6	8	44.4
NO RESPONSE	4	4.0	3	5.5	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0

TABLE V.4B: TEACHING BACKGROUND OF PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
HAVE PERMANENT CALIF CERT										
NO	6	9.5	2	33.3	1	14.3	1	100.0	7	70.0
YES	57	90.5	4	66.7	6	85.7	0	0	3	30.0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0
CERTIFIED IN OTHER STATE										
NO	51	81.0	5	83.3	6	85.7	1	100.0	7	70.0
YES	10	15.9	1	16.7	1	14.3	0	0	2	20.0
NO RESPONSE	2	3.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10.0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0

5.Type of Institution Attended

Tables V.5A-B show the percentages of teachers and principals who received their BA and highest degrees from colleges or universities in California or out of state. A high proportion of both elementary and secondary school teachers in the public and Catholic sectors reported that they received their BA degrees in the state of California. These percentages ranged from 63% to 100%. In contrast, the majority (between 60% and 70%) of teachers in the other religious and non-sectarian sectors received their BA degrees out of state. Differences between elementary and secondary levels for BA degrees were minimal, except in the case of Catholic private schools.

At the elementary level, the majority of teachers in all categories received their highest degrees from out of state. A slight majority of other religious and nonsectarian secondary school teachers also received their highest degrees from out-of-state. In contrast, the majority of public and Catholic secondary teachers had their highest degrees from in-state institutions.

The pattern for principals is somewhat different. About 66% of public school principals at both the elementary and secondary levels received their BA degrees in the state of California. However, between 53% and 90% of other religious and nonsectarian school principals were awarded BA degrees from out-of-state institutions. Catholic school teachers differed according to level; 56% of Catholic elementary principals held BA degrees from in-state institutions, while 83% of secondary principals held out-of-state BA degrees.

For their higher degrees, 50% to 79% of public and Catholic school principals chose in-state institutions; the majority of nonsectarian and other religious school principals still tended to go out of state for their highest degrees.

TABLE V.5A: TYPE OF INSTITUTION ATTENDED BY TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CODE FOR UNDERGRAD (BA DEG) COLLEGE ATTD										
INSTATE	165	64.7	110	69.6	2	100.0	13	37.1	16	40.0
OUTSTATE	90	35.3	48	30.4	0	0	22	62.9	24	60.0
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0
CODE FOR GRAD (HIGHEST DEG) COLLEGE ATTD										
INSTATE	123	48.2	58	36.7	2	100.0	7	20.0	12	30.0
OUTSTATE	132	51.8	100	63.3	0	0	28	80.0	28	70.0
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE V.5A: TYPE OF INSTITUTION ATTENDED BY TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CODE FOR UNDERGRAD (BA DEG) COLLEGE ATTD										
INSTATE	143	67.8	42	64.6	100	63.3	3	30.0	38	36.5
OUTSTATE	68	32.2	23	35.4	58	36.7	7	70.0	66	63.5
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0
CODE FOR GRAD (HIGHEST DEG) COLLEGE ATTD										
INSTATE	119	56.4	34	52.3	81	51.3	4	40.0	35	33.7
OUTSTATE	92	43.6	31	47.7	77	48.7	6	60.0	69	66.3
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

TABLE V.5B: TYPE OF INSTITUTION ATTENDED BY PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CODE FOR UNDERGRAD (BA DEG) COLLEGE ATTD								
INSTATE	65	65.7	30	54.5	9	47.4	8	44.4
OUTSTATE	34	34.3	25	45.5	10	52.6	10	55.6
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0
CODE FOR GRAD (HIGHEST DEG) COLLEGE ATTD								
INSTATE	78	78.8	27	49.1	8	42.1	9	50.0
OUTSTATE	21	21.2	28	50.9	11	57.9	9	50.0
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0

TABLE V.5B: TYPE OF INSTITUTION ATTENDED BY PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CODE FOR UNDERGRAD (BA DEG) COLLEGE ATTD										
INSTATE	42	66.7	1	16.7	4	57.1	0	0	1	10.0
OUTSTATE	21	33.3	5	83.3	3	42.9	1	100.0	9	90.0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0
CODE FOR GRAD (HIGHEST DEG) COLLEGE ATTD										
INSTATE	48	76.2	4	66.7	5	71.4	0	0	2	20.0
OUTSTATE	15	23.8	2	33.3	2	28.6	1	100.0	8	80.0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0

6.Attendance at Community College

In general, a relatively low percentage of school personnel in either the public or private sectors attended community college for one or more years (see Tables V.6A-B). Only three categories of schools had percentages of teachers and principals attending community colleges which were greater than 30%: public secondary (37% for teachers and principals); other religious elementary (32% for principals) and Catholic parochial elementary (34% for teachers).

TABLE V.6A: TEACHER'S ATTENDANCE AT COMMUNITY COLLEGE
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ATTENDED COMMUNITY COLLEGE 1 YR OR MORE										
NO	196	76.9	104	65.8	2	100.0	27	77.1	30	75.0
YES	58	22.7	53	33.5	0	0	8	22.9	9	22.5
NO RESPONSE	1	0.4	1	0.6	0	0	0	0	1	2.5
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE V.6A: TEACHER'S ATTENDANCE AT COMMUNITY COLLEGE
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ATTENDED COMMUNITY COLLEGE 1 YR OR MORE										
NO	129	61.1	52	80.0	140	88.6	9	90.0	96	92.3
YES	79	37.4	11	16.9	15	9.5	1	10.0	7	6.7
NO RESPONSE	3	1.4	2	3.1	3	1.9	0	0	1	1.0
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

TABLE V.6B: PRINCIPAL'S ATTENDANCE AT COMMUNITY COLLEGE
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ATTENDED COMMUNITY COLLEGE 1 YR OR MORE								
NO	73	73.7	50	90.9	13	68.4	16	88.9
YES	24	24.2	5	9.1	6	31.6	2	11.1
NO RESPONSE	2	2.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0

TABLE V.6B: PRINCIPAL'S ATTENDANCE AT COMMUNITY COLLEGE
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ATTENDED COMMUNITY COLLEGE 1 YR OR MORE										
NO	39	61.9	6	100.0	6	85.7	1	100.0	10	100.0
YES	23	36.5	0	0	1	14.3	0	0	0	0
NO RESPONSE	1	1.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0

7.Undergraduate and Graduate Majors

One of the most striking results of the study is the low percentages of teachers and principals in both public and private sectors who reported science as either an undergraduate or graduate major (see Tables V.7A-B). Only nonsectarian secondary teachers and Catholic private secondary principals had percentages greater than 25% for undergraduate science degrees. In almost all categories, a higher portion of secondary rather than elementary school teachers and principals reported taking science as their undergraduate or graduate major.

A second finding of interest is that greater proportions of teachers and principals responding from both sectors reported education as their graduate major. Only Catholic parochial and private, and nonsectarian secondary schools had over 20% of their teachers or principals with graduate degrees in a humanities or science area. Percentages of public school personnel holding graduate degrees in education were slightly higher than personnel in the other sectors.

There was less uniformity among school personnel in different categories with regard to choice of undergraduate major. Percentages of teachers majoring in the most common undergraduate majors -- education, social science and humanities -- varied among the categories. Secondary teachers showed the most uniformity, for in each category the highest percentage of teachers (30%-41%) received their degrees in humanities. In general, slightly higher percentages of elementary school teachers and principals majored in education; higher percentages of secondary teachers and principals majored in the humanities or social science areas. Note the relatively lower percentages of teachers and particularly principals (0% at the secondary level) in nonsectarian and Catholic parochial schools who received undergraduate degrees in education. Note also that fewer secondary teachers and principals held undergraduate degrees in education.

TABLE V.7A: TEACHER'S UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CODE FOR UNDERGRAD COLLEGE MAJOR										
BUSINESS	5	2.0	1	0.6	0	0	0	0	0	0
EDUCATION	111	43.5	43	27.2	0	0	14	40.0	13	32.5
HUMANITIES	39	15.3	41	25.9	1	50.0	8	22.9	12	30.0
SCIENCE	12	4.7	9	5.7	0	0	1	2.9	2	5.0
SOCIAL SCIENCE	69	27.1	46	29.1	0	0	6	17.1	11	27.5
OTHER	7	2.7	2	1.3	0	0	1	2.9	1	2.5
NO RESPONSE	12	4.7	16	10.1	1	50.0	5	14.3	1	2.5
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE V.7A: TEACHER'S UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CODE FOR UNDERGRAD COLLEGE MAJOR										
BUSINESS	14	6.6	2	3.1	2	1.3	0	0	1	1.0
EDUCATION	44	20.9	9	13.8	23	14.6	1	10.0	5	4.8
HUMANITIES	63	29.9	23	35.4	52	32.9	4	40.0	41	39.4
SCIENCE	36	17.1	8	12.3	19	12.0	1	10.0	27	26.0
SOCIAL SCIENCE	39	18.5	20	30.8	50	31.6	3	30.0	24	23.1
OTHER	3	1.4	1	1.5	5	3.2	1	10.0	1	1.0
NO RESPONSE	12	5.7	2	3.1	7	4.4	0	0	5	4.8
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

TABLE V.7A: PRINCIPAL'S UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CODE FOR UNDERGRAD COLLEGE MAJOR								
BUSINESS	5	5.1	0	0	0	0	0	0
EDUCATION	47	47.5	15	27.3	7	36.8	0	0
HUMANITIES	12	12.1	15	27.3	3	15.8	7	38.9
SCIENCE	7	7.1	2	3.6	2	10.5	1	5.6
SOCIAL SCIENCE	23	23.2	18	32.7	5	26.3	6	33.3
NO RESPONSE	5	5.1	5	9.1	2	10.5	4	22.2
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0

TABLE V.7A: PRINCIPAL'S UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CODE FOR UNDERGRAD COLLEGE MAJOR										
BUSINESS	3	4.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EDUCATION	16	25.4	0	0	1	14.3	0	0	0	0
HUMANITIES	14	22.2	3	50.0	2	28.6	0	0	3	30.0
SCIENCE	6	9.5	0	0	3	42.9	0	0	1	10.0
SOCIAL SCIENCE	20	31.7	3	50.0	0	0	0	0	5	50.0
OTHER	1	1.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NO RESPONSE	3	4.8	0	0	1	14.3	1	100.0	1	10.0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0

TABLE V.7B: TEACHER'S GRADUATE MAJOR
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CODE FOR GRAD (HIGHEST DEG) MAJOR										
BUSINESS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.5
EDUCATION	129	50.6	39	24.7	1	50.0	10	28.6	13	32.5
HUMANITIES	7	2.7	5	3.2	0	0	2	5.7	4	10.0
SCIENCE	1	0.4	2	1.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
SOCIAL SCIENCE	6	2.4	8	5.1	0	0	1	2.9	1	2.5
OTHER	2	0.8	0	0	0	0	1	2.9	0	0
NO RESPONSE	110	43.1	104	65.8	1	50.0	21	60.0	21	52.5
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE V.7B: TEACHER'S GRADUATE MAJOR
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CODE FOR GRAD (HIGHEST DEG) MAJOR										
BUSINESS	7	3.3	1	1.5	3	1.9	0	0	0	0
EDUCATION	93	44.1	21	32.3	44	27.8	3	30.0	29	27.9
HUMANITIES	17	8.1	14	21.5	22	13.9	0	0	27	26.0
SCIENCE	9	4.3	2	3.1	12	7.6	0	0	10	9.6
SOCIAL SCIENCE	11	5.2	6	9.2	20	12.7	1	10.0	7	6.7
OTHER	1	0.5	0	0	1	0.6	1	10.0	1	1.0
NO RESPONSE	73	34.6	21	32.3	56	35.4	5	50.0	30	28.8
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

TABLE V.7B : PRINCIPAL'S GRADUATE MAJOR
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CODE FOR GRAD (HIGHEST DEG) MAJOR								
EDUCATION	85	85.9	31	56.4	13	68.4	6	33.3
HUMANITIES	1	1.0	4	7.3	2	10.5	2	11.1
SCIENCE	1	1.0	1	1.8	0	0	0	0
SOCIAL SCIENCE	3	3.0	2	3.6	0	0	1	5.6
OTHER	0	0	1	1.8	0	0	0	0
NO RESPONSE	9	9.1	16	29.1	4	21.1	9	50.0
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0

TABLE V.7B : PRINCIPAL'S GRADUATE MAJOR
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CODE FOR GRAD (HIGHEST DEG) MAJOR										
EDUCATION	50	79.4	4	66.7	3	42.9	0	0	5	50.0
HUMANITIES	2	3.2	1	16.7	1	14.3	0	0	2	20.0
SCIENCE	2	3.2	0	0	1	14.3	0	0	0	0
SOCIAL SCIENCE	4	6.3	1	16.7	0	0	0	0	1	10.0
NO RESPONSE	5	7.9	0	0	2	28.6	1	100.0	2	20.0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0

8.Grade Point Average

The majority of teachers and principals in both public and private sectors reported their undergraduate GPA's were in the 2.6-3.5 range (see Tables V.8A-B). A smaller but still substantial percentage of these teachers and principals stated that their GPA's were above 3.5. In most cases, slightly higher percentages of teachers in the private sectors reported GPA's over 3.5. For example, 30% to 50% of Catholic private, other religious, and nonsectarian secondary school teachers indicated GPA's in the 3.6+ range, compared to about 20% of public and Catholic parochial school teachers. Nonsectarian elementary (44%) and Catholic parochial (33%) secondary principals reported relatively high percentages with GPA's above 3.5 . Perhaps it is even more important to note the low percentages (between 0% and 16%) of teachers and principals who reported GPA's in the 2.0 to 2.5 range.

TABLE V.8A: TEACHER'S UNDERGRADUATE GRADE POINT AVERAGE
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
UNDERGRAD GRADE POINT AVERAGE										
2.0-2.5	20	7.8	10	6.3	0	0	3	8.6	2	5.0
2.6-3.5	179	70.2	103	65.2	2	100.0	24	68.6	25	62.5
3.6+	56	22.0	45	28.5	0	0	8	22.9	13	32.5
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE V.8A: TEACHER'S UNDERGRADUATE GRADE POINT AVERAGE
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
UNDERGRAD GRADE POINT AVERAGE										
2.0-2.5	13	6.2	11	16.9	8	5.1	0	0	6	5.8
2.6-3.5	152	72.0	41	63.1	102	64.6	5	50.0	64	61.5
3.6+	46	21.8	13	20.0	48	30.4	5	50.0	34	32.7
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

TABLE V.8B: PRINCIPAL'S UNDERGRADUATE GRADE POINT AVERAGE
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
UNDERGRAD GRADE POINT AVERAGE								
2.0-2.5	9	9.1	1	1.8	3	15.8	1	5.6
2.6-3.5	74	74.7	42	76.4	15	78.9	9	50.0
3.6+	16	16.2	12	21.8	1	5.3	8	44.4
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0

TABLE V.8B: PRINCIPAL'S UNDERGRADUATE GRADE POINT AVERAGE
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
UNDERGRAD GRADE POINT AVERAGE										
2.0-2.5	1	1.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.6-3.5	51	81.0	4	66.7	5	71.4	1	100.0	9	90.0
3.6+	11	17.5	2	33.3	2	28.6	0	0	1	10.0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0

C . Background Information

1.Age

At both the elementary and secondary levels, public school teachers and principals were slightly older than teachers and principals in the other sectors (see Tables V.9A-B). For example, the mean age for public school elementary teachers was 44, compared to mean ages of 28 to 39 for elementary teachers in the private school types. Mean ages for Catholic private elementary (28) and other religious secondary (27) teachers were the lowest.

There was less variation in the mean ages of principals. Here the ranges were between 43 and 51. Not surprisingly, the mean ages of the principals were higher than the mean ages for teachers in each school category.

TABLEV.9A: AVERAGE AGE OF TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
AGE OF RESPONDENT	MEAN	44	37	28	36	39

TABLEV.9A: AVERAGE AGE OF TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
AGE OF RESPONDENT	MEAN	44	40	38	28	38

TABLEV.9B: AVERAGE AGE OF PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE			
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
AGE OF RESPONDENT	MEAN	50	46	45	43

TABLEV.9B: AVERAGE AGE OF PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
AGE OF RESPONDENT	MEAN	51	44	48	48	49

2.Sex

a. Teachers

The percentages of female and male teachers varied greatly according to grade level of students taught (see Tables V.10A). The majority (between 75% and 100%) of teachers at the elementary level were female in both public and private sectors. The teachers responding from Catholic elementary schools were almost exclusively female. At the secondary level, the proportions of male teachers were higher. Sixty percent of other religious and Catholic parochial, 59% of public, 46% of non-sectarian, and 33% of Catholic private secondary school teachers were male. Note that eventhough the proportion of male teachers increased in each category, only public and other religious schools had a majority of male secondary teachers.

TABLE V.10A: SEX OF TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TEACHER'S SEX										
FEMALE	191	74.9	144	91.1	2	100.0	28	80.0	35	87.5
MALE	58	22.7	12	7.6	0	0	7	20.0	5	12.5
NO RESPONSE	6	2.4	2	1.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE V.10A: SEX OF TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TEACHER'S SEX										
FEMALE	84	39.8	26	40.0	104	65.8	4	40.0	53	51.0
MALE	125	59.2	39	60.0	52	32.9	6	60.0	48	46.2
NO RESPONSE	2	0.9	0	0	2	1.3	0	0	3	2.9
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

b.Principals

Patterns for principals are different from those of teachers, showing in most cases an increase in the percentages of males. The majority of principals in both public elementary (72%) and secondary schools (81%) were male. This is considerabley different from the teacher population, where 75% of the elementary and 40% of the secondary teachers were female. Similarly, 80% of the other religious elementary school teachers were female, but 74% of the principals were male. However, elementary Catholic parochial and nonsectarian school principals were, like their teachers, predominantly female. At the secondary level, the majority of the principals in these two school types, 67% and 90% respectively, were male.

TABLE V.10B: SEX OF PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TEACHER'S SEX								
FEMALE	28	28.3	50	90.9	5	26.3	12	66.7
MALE	71	71.7	5	9.1	14	73.7	6	33.3
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0

TABLE V.10B: SEX OF PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TEACHER'S SEX										
FEMALE	12	19.0	2	33.3	6	85.7	0	0	1	10.0
MALE	51	81.0	4	66.7	1	14.3	1	100.0	9	90.0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0

3. Race and Ethnic Group

The vast majority of teachers and principals in both public and private sectors were caucasian (see Tables V.11A-B). The lowest percentages of white teachers were 84% in the Catholic parochial and 85% in elementary public schools. The lowest percentages of white principals were both in the public sector -- 80% at the elementary level and 76% at the secondary level, both of which were slightly lower than percentages for public school teachers. The minority groups with the greatest representation were hispanics (7%) among Catholic parochial elementary school principals and teachers and blacks(13%) among public secondary school principal respondents. The percentages of other racial groups represented in the private and public school personnel were small, ranging from 0% to 7%. Note the virtual absence of minority groups among other religious and nonsectarian teachers and principals, and all secondary principals except those in public schools.

TABLE V.11A: RACE AND ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
RACE/ETHNIC ORIGIN										
AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALSKAN NAT	0	0	2	1.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER	13	5.1	5	3.2	0	0	1	2.9	1	2.5
BLACK-NOT OF HISPANIC ORIGIN	11	4.3	0	0	0	0	1	2.9	0	0
FILIPINO	3	1.2	6	3.8	0	0	0	0	0	0
HISPANIC	3	1.2	11	7.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WHITE-NOT OF HISPANIC ORIGIN	218	85.5	134	84.8	2	100.0	33	94.3	39	97.5
NO RESPONSE	7	2.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE V.11[illegible]: RACE AND ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
RACE/ETHNIC ORIGIN										
AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALSKAN NAT	2	0.9	0	0	3	1.9	0	0	1	1.0
ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER	3	1.4	0	0	2	1.3	0	0	2	1.9
BLACK-NOT OF HISPANIC ORIGIN	9	4.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.0
FILIPINO	0	0	1	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0
HISPANIC	8	3.8	1	1.5	11	7.0	0	0	1	1.0
WHITE-NOT OF HISPANIC ORIGIN	183	86.7	63	96.9	140	88.6	10	100.0	98	94.2
NO RESPONSE	6	2.8	0	0	2	1.3	0	0	1	1.0
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

TABLE V.11B: RACE AND ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
RACE/ETHNIC ORIGIN								
AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALSKAN NAT	2	2.0	0	0	1	5.3	0	0
ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER	5	5.1	0	0	1	5.3	0	0
BLACK-NOT OF HISPANIC ORIGIN	5	5.1	0	0	0	0	1	5.6
FILIPINO	1	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HISPANIC	5	5.1	3	5.5	0	0	0	0
WHITE-NOT OF HISPANIC ORIGIN	79	79.8	52	94.5	17	89.5	17	94.4
NO RESPONSE	2	2.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0

TABLE V.11B: RACE AND ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
RACE/ETHNIC ORIGIN										
AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALSKAN NAT	1	1.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER	1	1.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BLACK-NOT OF HISPANIC ORIGIN	8	12.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HISPANIC	3	4.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WHITE-NOT OF HISPANIC ORIGIN	48	76.2	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0
NO RESPONSE	2	3.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0

4. Marital Status

Marital status of teachers varied both according to type of school and elementary or secondary level. Four general patterns emerged. First, slightly higher percentages of elementary teachers were married than secondary teachers in the private sector. In the public sector, 67% of teachers at both the elementary and secondary levels were married. Second, a greater percentage of principals were married than teachers except for principals in Catholic schools at both levels and nonsectarian elementary schools. Third, a higher percentage of school personnel who were single were found in schools with a religious affiliation, particularly Catholic schools. It is interesting to note that only in these schools were a majority of teachers or principals single. For example, about 85% of Catholic principals were single. Fourth, a greater percentage of divorced, separated or widowed personnel were found among public and nonsectarian schools. The highest percentages in these categories were quite low: 15% among public secondary and nonsectarian elementary teachers and 17% among nonsectarian elementary principals.

Tables V.12A-B show the actual percentages in each category from which the above patterns were inferred. Many of these patterns are consistent with previous findings and knowledge. One would expect a much higher percentage of single personnel in Catholic schools, and lower divorce rates in schools with a religious affiliation. Since principals are generally older than teachers, one would also expect to find a higher percentage of married principals.

TABLE V.12A: MARITAL STATUS OF TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
MARITAL STATUS										
SINGLE	44	17.3	68	43.0	1	50.0	6	17.1	9	22.5
MARRIED	171	67.1	76	48.1	1	50.0	28	80.0	25	62.5
DIVORCED,SEPARATED,WIDOWED	34	13.3	13	8.2	0	0	1	2.9	6	15.0
NO RESPONSE	6	2.4	1	0.6	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE V.12A: MARITAL STATUS OF TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
MARITAL STATUS										
SINGLE	36	17.1	34	52.3	70	44.3	6	60.0	36	34.6
MARRIED	142	67.3	24	36.9	75	47.5	4	40.0	51	49.0
DIVORCED,SEPARATED,WIDOWED	31	14.7	6	9.2	11	7.0	0	0	15	14.4
NO RESPONSE	2	0.9	1	1.5	2	1.3	0	0	2	1.9
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

TABLE V.12B: MARITAL STATUS OF PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
MARITAL STATUS								
SINGLE	6	6.1	47	85.5	2	10.5	5	27.8
MARRIED	84	84.8	6	10.9	16	84.2	10	55.6
DIVORCED,SEPARATED,WIDOWED	8	8.1	2	3.6	1	5.3	3	16.7
NO RESPONSE	1	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0

TABLE V.12B: MARITAL STATUS OF PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
MARITAL STATUS										
SINGLE	4	6.3	5	83.3	6	85.7	0	0	0	0
MARRIED	54	85.7	1	16.7	1	14.3	1	100.0	9	90.0
DIVORCED,SEPARATED,WIDOWED	4	6.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10.0
NO RESPONSE	1	1.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0

5.Family Size

Teachers and principals were asked about family size and instructed to count themselves plus family members who would presently be counted as dependents on their or their spouse's tax returns. The results of this question are in Tables V.13A-B below. The average family size for elementary teachers was 3 persons, except for Catholic private teachers who had a mean of 1.5 family members. Secondary school teachers, on the other hand, had an average family size of 2, except for teahers in the public sector who had 3 person family units.

Principals were not such a uniform group. Public and other religious elementary school principals had an average family size of 3.1 and 3.5, respectively; Catholic parochial and nonsectarian teachers had 2 family members. Secondary school principals in public and nonsectarian sectors had an average family size of 3; those in Catholic parochial and private schools had an average family size of 2.

It is interesting to note that the average family size for all public school teachers and principals was about 3 members. In contrast, the average family size for all Catholic parochial and private schools teachers and principals was 2 (exception: Catholic parochial elementary).

TABLE V.13A: FAMILY SIZE: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
SIZE OF RESPONDENTS FAMILY IN HOME	MEAN	2.7	2.7	1.5	2.7	3.1

TABLE V.13A: FAMILY SIZE: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
SIZE OF RESPONDENTS FAMILY IN HOME	MEAN	2.8	2.3	2.3	1.9	2.2

TABLE V.13B: FAMILY SIZE: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE			
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
SIZE OF RESPONDENTS FAMILY IN HOME	MEAN	3.1	1.7	3.5	2.2

TABLE V.13B: FAMILY SIZE: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
SIZE OF RESPONDENTS FAMILY IN HOME	MEAN	3.1	2.0	1.8	2.0	3.4

6.Parents' Years of Schooling.

Teachers and principals were asked to indicate the number of years of schooling for each parent. Tables V.14A-B show the mean years of schooling for mothers and fathers, with 12 years representing a high school diploma and 16 years a bachelors degree. In general, both mothers and fathers had at least attended high school and there were few differences in the number of years of schooling for fathers and mothers. The maximum difference between mean years of schooling for mothers and fathers for any category was two years (exception: Catholic private elementary teachers with only 2 respondents). There was considerably more variation by school type in the reported years of schooling teachers' and principals' parents. Average years of schooling for parents of teachers in all categories ranged between 11-15 years. Teachers in the other religious sector reported slightly higher years of schooling for both parents (14 or 15) compared to the other groups. Catholic private teachers reported fewer years of schooling for fathers -- an average of 8 years at the elementary level and 11 at the secondary level.

Principals' parents had, on average, fewer years of schooling than teachers' parents. Nonsectarian elementary and secondary school principals indicated slightly more years of education for both parents (13 to 15 years) than principals in all other sectors. The other religious secondary school principals, in contrast to teachers in this same category, reported the lowest average years of schooling experience for both parents, 8 years compared to between 10 and 15 years for the other sectors.

TABLE V.14A: PARENTS' YEARS OF SCHOOLING: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
FATHERS YRS OF SCHOOLING	MEAN	12.7	12.3	8.0	13.9	12.3
MOTHERS YRS OF EDUCATION	MEAN	12.6	12.4	12.5	13.9	13.3

TABLE V.14A: PARENTS' YEARS OF SCHOOLING: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
FATHERS YRS OF SCHOOLING	MEAN	12.2	12.6	11.2	15.0	12.6
MOTHERS YRS OF EDUCATION	MEAN	12.3	12.5	12.8	13.9	14.3

TABLE V.14B: PARENTS' YEARS OF SCHOOLING: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE			
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
FATHERS YRS OF SCHOOLING	MEAN	10.8	11.2	11.8	14.6
MOTHERS YRS OF EDUCATION	MEAN	11.4	10.8	10.8	13.2

TABLE V.14B: PARENTS' YEARS OF SCHOOLING: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
FATHERS YRS OF SCHOOLING	MEAN	9.7	10.0	13.0	8.0	13.8
MOTHERS YRS OF EDUCATION	MEAN	11.1	11.4	12.3	8.0	12.8

7. Parents' Occupation.

a. Teachers

Parents of elementary and secondary school teachers in both public and private sectors were employed in similar occupations (see Tables V.15A). The largest percentages of fathers (beween 34% and 55%) were employed as professionals, technicians, managers or administrators. Other common occupations chosen by fathers were laborers or craftsmen, in the public and Catholic sectors, and service workers (e.g., food, health, personnel or protective service) in the other religious and non-sectarian sectors. In contrast, the largest percentages of mothers (between 30% and 48%) in each school type except other religious secondary were categorized as housepersons. Relatively large percentages of mothers (between 10 and 40%) were also employed as professionals or administrators, and sales or clerical personnel.

TABLE V.15A: PARENTS' OCCUPATION: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FATHERS OCCUPATION										
PROF, TECH, MANGR OR ADMIN	122	47.8	71	44.9	0	0	15	42.9	21	52.5
FARM MANAGER OR OWNER	22	8.6	5	3.2	0	0	3	8.6	1	2.5
SALES OR CLERICAL WORKER	22	8.6	13	8.2	0	0	5	14.3	2	5.0
CRAFTSMAN OR OPERATIVE	34	13.3	20	12.7	0	0	3	8.6	1	2.5
SERVICE WORKER	9	3.5	10	6.3	0	0	5	14.3	5	12.5
LABORER	28	11.0	15	9.5	0	0	2	5.7	2	5.0
PRIV HSELHLD OR FM WORKER	3	1.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HOUSEPERSON	1	0.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NO RESPONSE	14	5.5	24	15.2	2	100.0	2	5.7	8	20.0
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0
MOTHERS OCCUPATION										
PROF, TECH, MNGR OR ADMIN	63	24.7	29	18.4	1	50.0	12	34.3	10	25.0
FARM MANAGER OR OWNER	5	2.0	2	1.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
SALES OR CLERICAL WORKER	40	15.7	39	24.7	0	0	5	14.3	4	10.0
CRAFTSMAN OR OPERATIVE	5	2.0	7	4.4	0	0	1	2.9	3	7.5
SERVICE WORKER	6	2.4	6	3.8	0	0	3	8.6	0	0
LABORER	3	1.2	3	1.9	1	50.0	0	0	3	7.5
PRIVATE HOUSELHOLD OR FARM WORKER	5	2.0	3	1.9	0	0	0	0	1	2.5
HOUSEPERSON	107	42.0	65	41.1	0	0	12	34.3	19	47.5
NO RESPONSE	21	8.2	4	2.5	0	0	2	5.7	0	0
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE V.15A: PARENTS' OCCUPATION: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FATHERS OCCUPATION										
PROF, TECH, MANGR OR ADMIN	89	42.2	34	52.3	53	33.5	7	70.0	57	54.8
FARM MANAGER OR OWNER	18	8.5	3	4.6	4	2.5	1	10.0	2	1.9
SALES OR CLERICAL WORKER	17	8.1	5	7.7	12	7.6	0	0	3	2.9
CRAFTSMAN OR OPERATIVE	39	18.5	9	13.8	17	10.8	0	0	5	4.8
SERVICE WORKER	13	6.2	2	3.1	13	8.2	2	20.0	6	5.8
LABORER	30	14.2	7	10.8	13	8.2	0	0	2	1.9
PRIV HSELHLD OR FM WORKER	2	0.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HOUSEPERSON	1	0.5	1	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0
NO RESPONSE	2	0.9	4	6.2	46	29.1	0	0	29	27.9
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0
MOTHERS OCCUPATION										
PROF, TECH, MNGR OR ADMIN	49	23.2	14	21.5	43	27.2	4	40.0	34	32.7
FARM MANAGER OR OWNER	0	0	0	0	1	0.6	0	0	1	1.0
SALES OR CLERICAL WORKER	24	11.4	14	21.5	25	15.8	2	20.0	12	11.5
CRAFTSMAN OR OPERATIVE	4	1.9	1	1.5	7	4.4	0	0	3	2.9
SERVICE WORKER	14	6.6	6	9.2	9	5.7	1	10.0	7	6.7
LABORER	7	3.3	1	1.5	5	3.2	0	0	3	2.9
PRIVATE HOUSELHOLD OR FARM WORKER	4	1.9	3	4.6	1	0.6	0	0	0	0
HOUSEPERSON	102	48.3	24	36.9	59	37.3	3	30.0	43	41.3
NO RESPONSE	7	3.3	2	3.1	8	5.1	0	0	1	1.0
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

b.Principals

The occupations for principals' parents show similar patterns but with wider percentage ranges and more diversity, perhaps due to smaller numbers of respondents (see Tables V.15B). Between 29% and 67% of elementary principals' fathers were in the professional/ administrative category; between 6% and 21% were in the craftsman or operative occupations. Secondary school principals showed even more diversity in parents occupations. Note the particularly high percentages of nonsectarian principals' fathers employed as professionals or administrators (67% elementary and 80% secondary), Catholic parochial principals' fathers employed as laborers (33%), and other religious elementary principals' fathers employed as farmers (21%).

Elementary and secondary school principals' mothers were, as in the case of teachers, primarily housepersons. Fairly high percentages of mothers of principals in nonsectarian and public schools were employed as professionals, technicians, administrators or managers.

177

TABLE V.15B: PARENTS' OCCUPATION: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FATHERS OCCUPATION								
PROF, TECH, MANGR OR ADMIN	41	41.4	16	29.1	7	36.8	12	66.7
FARM MANAGER OR OWNER	11	11.1	0	0	4	21.1	2	11.1
SALES OR CLERICAL WORKER	6	6.1	6	10.9	2	10.5	1	5.6
CRAFTSMAN OR OPERATIVE	21	21.2	10	18.2	3	15.8	1	5.6
SERVICE WORKER	6	6.1	8	14.5	0	0	1	5.6
LABORER	13	13.1	12	21.8	2	10.5	1	5.6
PRIV HSELHLD OR FM WORKER	0	0	1	1.8	0	0	0	0
NO RESPONSE	1	1.0	2	3.6	1	5.3	0	0
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0
MOTHERS OCCUPATION								
PROF, TECH, MNGR OR ADMIN	19	19.2	3	5.5	2	10.5	7	38.9
FARM MANAGER OR OWNER	1	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SALES OR CLERICAL WORKER	7	7.1	6	10.9	3	15.8	0	0
CRAFTSMAN OR OPERATIVE	4	4.0	2	3.6	1	5.3	1	5.6
SERVICE WORKER	8	8.1	7	12.7	2	10.5	1	5.6
LABORER	3	3.0	2	3.6	0	0	0	0
PRIVATE HOUSELHOLD OR FARM WORKER	1	1.0	1	1.8	1	5.3	0	0
HOUSEPERSON	54	54.5	31	56.4	9	47.4	9	50.0
NO RESPONSE	2	2.0	3	5.5	1	5.3	0	0
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0

TABLE V.15B: PARENTS' OCCUPATION: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
FATHERS OCCUPATION										
PROF, TECH, MANGR OR ADMIN	23	36.5	1	16.7	2	28.6	0	0	8	80.0
FARM MANAGER OR OWNER	7	11.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SALES OR CLERICAL WORKER	4	6.3	0	0	2	28.6	0	0	1	10.0
CRAFTSMAN OR OPERATIVE	8	12.7	2	33.3	1	14.3	0	0	0	0
SERVICE WORKER	8	12.7	0	0	1	14.3	0	0	0	0
LABORER	8	12.7	2	33.3	1	14.3	1	100.0	1	10.0
PRIV HSELHLD OR FM WORKER	3	4.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NO RESPONSE	2	3.2	1	16.7	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0
MOTHERS OCCUPATION										
PROF, TECH, MNGR OR ADMIN	14	22.2	1	16.7	0	0	0	0	3	30.0
SALES OR CLERICAL WORKER	8	12.7	0	0	1	14.3	0	0	0	0
CRAFTSMAN OR OPERATIVE	1	1.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SERVICE WORKER	5	7.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10.0
LABORER	0	0	1	16.7	0	0	0	0	1	10.0
PRIVATE HOUSELHOLD OR FARM WORKER	1	1.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HOUSEPERSON	29	46.0	3	50.0	5	71.4	1	100.0	4	40.0
NO RESPONSE	5	7.9	1	16.7	1	14.3	0	0	1	10.0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0

7.Health

Teachers and principals were asked to answer 'yes' or 'no' to two questions regarding health: 1) Do you have any health problem or condition that limits in any way the amount or kind of work you can do?; 2) Has your health ever prevented you from working for six months or more in a row?

An overwhelming majority (between 88% and 100%) of teachers and principals in all sectors and levels responded 'no' to both questions, indicating that their health did not limit their work. (See Tables V.16 and V.17)

TABLE V.16A: HEALTH LIMITS WORK: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
HAS HEALTH PROBLEMS THAT LIMIT WORK										
NO	238	93.3	151	95.6	2	100.0	34	97.1	38	95.0
YES	17	6.7	5	3.2	0	0	1	2.9	2	5.0
NO RESPONSE	0	0	2	1.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE V.16A: HEALTH LIMITS WORK: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
HAS HEALTH PROBLEMS THAT LIMIT WORK										
NO	199	94.3	60	92.3	142	89.9	10	100.0	102	98.1
YES	12	5.7	5	7.7	15	9.5	0	0	2	1.9
NO RESPONSE	0	0	0	0	1	0.6	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

TABLE V.16B: HEALTH LIMITS WORK: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
HAS HEALTH PROBLEMS THAT LIMIT WORK								
NO	94	94.9	53	96.4	17	89.5	18	100.0
YES	4	4.0	2	3.6	2	10.5	0	0
NO RESPONSE	1	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0

TABLE V.16B: HEALTH LIMITS WORK: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
HAS HEALTH PROBLEMS THAT LIMIT WORK										
NO	62	98.4	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0
YES	1	1.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0

TABLE V.17A: HEALTH KEPT FROM WORK FOR 6 MONTHS OR MORE: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
HAS MISSED 6 MNTHS WORK DUE TO HLTH PROB										
NO	244	95.7	157	99.4	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0
YES	6	2.4	1	0.6	0	0	0	0	0	0
NO RESPONSE	5	2.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE V.17A: HEALTH KEPT FROM WORK FOR 6 MONTHS OR MORE: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
HAS MISSED 6 MNTHS WORK DUE TO HLTH PROB										
NO	207	98.1	63	96.9	155	98.1	9	90.0	103	99.0
YES	2	0.9	1	1.5	3	1.9	1	10.0	0	0
NO RESPONSE	2	0.9	1	1.5	0	0	0	0	1	1.0
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

TABLE V.17B: HEALTH KEPT FROM WORK FOR 6 MONTHS OR MORE: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
HAS MISSED 6 MNTHS WORK DUE TO HLTH PROB								
NO	98	99.0	53	96.4	19	100.0	18	100.0
YES	1	1.0	1	1.8	0	0	0	0
NO RESPONSE	0	0	1	1.8	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0

TABLE V.17B: HEALTH KEPT FROM WORK FOR 6 MONTHS OR MORE: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
HAS MISSED 6 MNTHS WORK DUE TO HLTH PROB										
NO	61	96.8	6	100.0	6	85.7	1	100.0	10	100.0
YES	2	3.2	0	0	1	14.3	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0

D. Attitudes Toward the Profession

1. Reasons For Becoming an Educator

Individuals have various reasons and priorities in choosing their work. Teachers and principals were asked to select the two most important factors from the following list that led them to choose their current position: salary and fringe benefits; employment conditions (hours, location); types of students served; general commitment to working with children; commitment to furthering religious values; commitment to serving their religious organization; lack of attractive job alternatives; other.

The responses to this question were quite interesting (see Tables V.18A-B). Two of the more common reasons for becoming an educator selected by both teachers and principals in virtually all sectors were general commitment to working with children and employment conditions. For example, 69%-82% of elementary teachers cited general commitment to children as a reason for choosing their current positions; 30%-61% of the same group selected employment conditions. Employment conditions were an increasingly important factor for teachers in public and nonsectarian sectors at each level (39%-63%).

Other reasons for becoming an educator varied among the respondents in different sectors. Not surprisingly, a fairly large percentage of personnel in Catholic parochial, private and other religious schools cited 'commitment to religious values' and 'commitment to religious organization' as reasons for becoming an educator. The percentages of principals choosing these two reasons were slightly higher than for teachers in these sectors. The percentages of nonsectarian teachers and principals choosing 'types of students served' as an important reason were higher than for any other sector. For example, 51% of nonsectarian secondary teachers chose this reason, compared to 20% of public, 38% of Catholic parochial and 39% of Catholic private secondary teachers.

It is important to note that primarily public sector personnel considered salary and fringe benefits an important factor. Betweeen 11%

and 22% of public school teachers and principals chose this reason, compared to 0% to 10% in the other sectors. A very positive outcome of this question is that virtually no personnel cited 'lack of attractive job alternatives' as a reason for becoming an educator.

TABLE V.18A: REASONS FOR BECOMING AN EDUCATOR: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CHOSE CURRENT POS FOR SALARY & FRINGES										
NOT SELECTED	220	86.3	156	98.7	2	100.0	33	94.3	36	90.0
SALARY AND FRINGE BENEFITS	29	11.4	2	1.3	0	0	1	2.9	3	7.5
NO RESPONSE	6	2.4	0	0	0	0	1	2.9	1	2.5
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0
CHOSE CURRENT POS FOR DESIRED HRS-LOCATN										
NOT SELECTED	93	36.5	104	65.8	2	100.0	24	68.6	20	50.0
EMPLOYMENT CONDITIONS	156	61.2	54	34.2	0	0	11	31.4	20	50.0
NO RESPONSE	6	2.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0
CHOSE CURRENT POS FOR TYPES OF PUPILS										
NOT SELECTED	204	80.0	124	78.5	1	50.0	27	77.1	34	85.0
TYPES OF STUDENTS SERVED	45	17.6	34	21.5	0	0	8	22.9	6	15.0
NO RESPONSE	6	2.4	0	0	1	50.0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0
CHOSE CURRENT POS TO WORK W/ CHILDREN										
NOT SELECTED	70	27.5	43	27.2	1	50.0	11	31.4	7	17.5
GENERAL COMMITMENT	179	70.2	115	72.8	1	50.0	24	68.6	33	82.5
NO RESPONSE	6	2.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

(CONTINUED)

TABLE V.18A: REASONS FOR BECOMING AN EDUCATOR: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CHOSE CURRENT POS TO FURTHER RELG VALUES										
NOT SELECTED	247	96.9	104	65.8	2	100.0	16	45.7	39	97.5
COMMITMENT TO RELIGIOUS VALUES	2	0.8	54	34.2	0	0	19	54.3	1	2.5
NO RESPONSE	6	2.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0
CHOSE CURRENT POS TO SERVE RELIG ORGNZTN										
NOT SELECTED	248	97.3	134	84.8	2	100.0	33	94.3	40	100.0
COMMITMENT TO MY RELIGIOUS ORGAN.	1	0.4	24	15.2	0	0	2	5.7	0	0
NO RESPONSE	6	2.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0
CHOSE CURRENT POS FOR LACK OF ALTERNATVS										
NOT SELECTED	217	85.1	145	91.8	2	100.0	33	94.3	35	87.5
LACK OF ATTRACTIVE JOB ALTERNATIVES	32	12.5	13	8.2	0	0	2	5.7	5	12.5
NO RESPONSE	6	2.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0
CHOSE CURRENT POS FOR MISC REASONS										
NOT SELECTED	216	84.7	153	96.8	1	50.0	34	97.1	29	72.5
OTHER (SPECIFIED)	33	12.9	5	3.2	1	50.0	1	2.9	11	27.5
NO RESPONSE	6	2.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE V.18A: REASONS FOR BECOMING AN EDUCATOR: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CHOSE CURRENT POS TO FURTHER RELG VALUES										
NOT SELECTED	203	96.2	42	64.6	108	68.4	5	50.0	102	98.1
COMMITMENT TO RELIGIOUS VALUES	4	1.9	23	35.4	50	31.6	5	50.0	2	1.9
NO RESPONSE	4	1.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0
CHOSE CURRENT POS TO SERVE RELIG ORGNZTN										
NOT SELECTED	206	97.6	53	81.5	128	81.0	7	70.0	104	100.0
COMMITMENT TO MY RELIGIOUS ORGAN.	1	0.5	12	18.5	30	19.0	3	30.0	0	0
NO RESPONSE	4	1.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0
CHOSE CURRENT POS FOR LACK OF ALTERNATVS										
NOT SELECTED	179	84.8	60	92.3	146	92.4	9	90.0	92	88.5
LACK OF ATTRACTIVE JOB ALTERNATIVES	28	13.3	5	7.7	12	7.6	1	10.0	12	11.5
NO RESPONSE	4	1.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0
CHOSE CURRENT POS FOR MISC REASONS										
NOT SELECTED	173	82.0	62	95.4	143	90.5	10	100.0	82	78.8
OTHER (SPECIFIED)	34	16.1	3	4.6	15	9.5	0	0	22	21.2
NO RESPONSE	4	1.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

TABLE V.18A: REASONS FOR BECOMING AN EDUCATOR: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CHOSE CURRENT POS FOR SALARY & FRINGES										
NOT SELECTED	172	81.5	65	100.0	155	98.1	9	90.0	99	95.2
SALARY AND FRINGE BENEFITS	35	16.6	0	0	2	1.3	1	10.0	3	2.9
NO RESPONSE	4	1.9	0	0	1	0.6	0	0	2	1.9
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0
CHOSE CURRENT POS FOR DESIRED HRS-LOCATN										
NOT SELECTED	75	35.5	43	66.2	97	61.4	6	60.0	44	42.3
EMPLOYMENT CONDITIONS	132	62.6	22	33.8	61	38.6	4	40.0	60	57.7
NO RESPONSE	4	1.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0
CHOSE CURRENT POS FOR TYPES OF PUPILS										
NOT SELECTED	164	77.7	40	61.5	96	60.8	10	100.0	51	49.0
TYPES OF STUDENTS SERVED	43	20.4	25	38.5	62	39.2	0	0	53	51.0
NO RESPONSE	4	1.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0
CHOSE CURRENT POS TO WORK W/ CHILDREN										
NOT SELECTED	89	42.2	30	46.2	86	54.4	3	30.0	57	54.8
GENERAL COMMITMENT	118	55.9	35	53.8	72	45.6	7	70.0	47	45.2
NO RESPONSE	4	1.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

(CONTINUED)

TABLE V.18B: REASONS FOR BECOMING AN EDUCATOR: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CHOSE CURRENT POS FOR SALARY & FRINGES								
NOT SELECTED	83	83.8	54	98.2	19	100.0	17	94.4
SALARY AND FRINGE BENEFITS	16	16.2	1	1.8	0	0	1	5.6
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0
CHOSE CURRENT POS FOR DESIRED HRS-LOCATN								
NOT SELECTED	58	58.6	51	92.7	18	94.7	9	50.0
EMPLOYMENT CONDITIONS	39	39.4	4	7.3	1	5.3	9	50.0
NO RESPONSE	2	2.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0
CHOSE CURRENT POS FOR TYPES OF PUPILS								
NOT SELECTED	83	83.8	53	96.4	18	94.7	12	66.7
TYPES OF STUDENTS SERVED	16	16.2	2	3.6	1	5.3	6	33.3
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0
CHOSE CURRENT POS TO WORK W/ CHILDREN								
NOT SELECTED	24	24.2	19	34.5	7	36.8	6	33.3
GENERAL COMMITMENT	75	75.8	36	65.5	12	63.2	12	66.7
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0
CHOSE CURRENT POS TO FURTHER RELG VALUES								
NOT SELECTED	99	100.0	18	32.7	5	26.3	18	100.0
COMMITMENT TO RELIGIOUS VALUES	0	0	37	67.3	14	73.7	0	0
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0
CHOSE CURRENT POS TO SERVE RELIG ORGNZTN								
NOT SELECTED	99	100.0	31	56.4	11	57.9	18	100.0
COMMITMENT TO MY RELIGIOUS ORGAN.	0	0	24	43.6	8	42.1	0	0
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0
CHOSE CURRENT POS FOR LACK OF ALTERNATVS								
NOT SELECTED	90	90.9	52	94.5	18	94.7	18	100.0
LACK OF ATTRACTIVE JOB ALTERNATIVES	9	9.1	3	5.5	1	5.3	0	0
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0

TABLE V.18B: REASONS FOR BECOMING AN EDUCATOR: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CHOSE CURRENT POS FOR SALARY & FRINGES										
NOT SELECTED	47	74.6	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	9	90.0
SALARY AND FRINGE BENEFITS	14	22.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10.0
NO RESPONSE	2	3.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0
CHOSE CURRENT POS FOR DESIRED HRS-LOCATN										
NOT SELECTED	35	55.6	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	5	50.0
EMPLOYMENT CONDITIONS	26	41.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	50.0
NO RESPONSE	2	3.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0
CHOSE CURRENT POS FOR TYPES OF PUPILS										
NOT SELECTED	49	77.8	6	100.0	7	100.0	0	0	6	60.0
TYPES OF STUDENTS SERVED	12	19.0	0	0	0	0	1	100.0	4	40.0
NO RESPONSE	2	3.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0
CHOSE CURRENT POS TO WORK W/ CHILDREN										
NOT SELECTED	15	23.8	4	66.7	3	42.9	1	100.0	6	60.0
GENERAL COMMITMENT	46	73.0	2	33.3	4	57.1	0	0	4	40.0
NO RESPONSE	2	3.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0

(CONTINUED)

TABLE V.18B: REASONS FOR BECOMING AN EDUCATOR: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CHOSE CURRENT POS TO FURTHER RELG VALUES										
NOT SELECTED	61	96.8	3	50.0	3	42.9	0	0	10	100.0
COMMITMENT TO RELIGIOUS VALUES	0	0	3	50.0	4	57.1	1	100.0	0	0
NO RESPONSE	2	3.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0
CHOSE CURRENT POS TO SERVE RELIG ORGNZTN										
NOT SELECTED	61	96.8	3	50.0	3	42.9	1	100.0	10	100.0
COMMITMENT TO MY RELIGIOUS ORGAN.	0	0	3	50.0	4	57.1	0	0	0	0
NO RESPONSE	2	3.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0
CHOSE CURRENT POS FOR LACK OF ALTERNATVS										
NOT SELECTED	58	92.1	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0
LACK OF ATTRACTIVE JOB ALTERNATIVES	3	4.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NO RESPONSE	2	3.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0
CHOSE CURRENT POS FOR MISC REASONS										
NOT SELECTED	49	77.8	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	7	70.0
OTHER (SPECIFIED)	12	19.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	30.0
NO RESPONSE	2	3.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0

2. Plans to Remain in Education

Teachers and principals were asked how long they planned to remain in education and were given the following alternatives: until eligible for early retirement, until normal retirement, leave education as soon as possible, or undecided (see Tables V.19A-B). The two most common responses given by personnel in all sectors were 'until normal retirement age' and 'undecided'. Between 28% and 85% stated 'until normal retirment; from 10% to 70% responded 'undecided'. With the exception of the nonsectarian sector, a greater percentage of principals than teachers within a given sector indicated they would stay in education until normal retirement age.

A relatively large percentage of public school teachers and principals (between 22% and 28%) indicated they would choose early retirement. Twenty-one percent of other religious elementary principals and 40% of nonsectarian secondary school principals also chose this response. No more than 13% of the personnel in any sector stated they would leave education as soon as possible. Categories with 10%-13% of the personnnel choosing this response were public school teachers, Catholic private secondary teachers, and public and other religious elementary school principals. Secondary school principals appeared to be the most satisfied with their positions, but there were fewer respondents in this sector.

TABLE V.19A: PLANS TO REMAIN IN EDUCATION: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
PLANS TO REMAIN IN EDUCATION										
UNTIL ELIG FOR EARLY RETIREMNT	59	23.1	18	11.4	0	0	2	5.7	0	0
UNTIL NORMAL RETIREMENT AGE	92	36.1	67	42.4	0	0	14	40.0	11	27.5
LEAVE EDUC AS SOON AS POSS	31	12.2	12	7.6	0	0	3	8.6	0	0
UNDECIDED	69	27.1	56	35.4	2	100.0	14	40.0	25	62.5
NO RESPONSE	4	1.6	5	3.2	0	0	2	5.7	4	10.0
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE V.19A: PLANS TO REMAIN IN EDUCATION: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
PLANS TO REMAIN IN EDUCATION										
UNTIL ELIG FOR EARLY RETIREMNT	60	28.4	7	10.8	9	5.7	0	0	8	7.7
UNTIL NORMAL RETIREMENT AGE	65	30.8	31	47.7	60	38.0	1	10.0	44	42.3
LEAVE EDUC AS SOON AS POSS	23	10.9	5	7.7	21	13.3	1	10.0	7	6.7
UNDECIDED	57	27.0	22	33.8	64	40.5	7	70.0	44	42.3
NO RESPONSE	6	2.8	0	0	4	2.5	1	10.0	1	1.0
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

TABLE V.19B: PLANS TO REMAIN IN EDUCATION: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
PLANS TO REMAIN IN EDUCATION								
UNTIL ELIG FOR EARLY RETIREMNT	24	24.2	4	7.3	4	21.1	2	11.1
UNTIL NORMAL RETIREMENT AGE	43	43.4	34	61.8	8	42.1	5	27.8
LEAVE EDUC AS SOON AS POSS	11	11.1	1	1.8	2	10.5	0	0
UNDECIDED	21	21.2	15	27.3	4	21.1	11	61.1
NO RESPONSE	0	0	1	1.8	1	5.3	0	0
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0

TABLE V.19B: PLANS TO REMAIN IN EDUCATION: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
PLANS TO REMAIN IN EDUCATION										
UNTIL ELIG FOR EARLY RETIREMNT	14	22.2	0	0	0	0	1	100.0	4	40.0
UNTIL NORMAL RETIREMENT AGE	33	52.4	4	66.7	6	85.7	0	0	4	40.0
LEAVE EDUC AS SOON AS POSS	5	7.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
UNDECIDED	10	15.9	2	33.3	1	14.3	0	0	1	10.0
NO RESPONSE	1	1.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10.0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0

3.Commitment to Present School

Teachers and principals were asked: Do you have a strong sense of commitment and loyalty to your present school? The vast majority of personnel in all sectors responded affirmatively (see Tables V.20A-B). One hundred percent of secondary school principals were committed to their present schools. The percentages of elementary principals who responded positively were also high, ranging from 79% of other religious to 98% of Catholic parochial principals. In general, principals appeared to be more committed to their schools than teachers.

Among teachers, the percentages of those who were committed ranged from 70% to 100%. Within each level (elementary or secondary), the lowest percentages of teachers who expressed loyalty to their schools were in public and other religious schools. The lowest percentages of personnel expressing such commitment were found among secondary school teachers.

TABLE V.20A: ARE TEACHERS COMMITTED TO PRESENT SCHOOL?
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STRONG COMMITMENT TO SCHOOL										
NO	39	15.3	10	6.3	0	0	3	8.6	2	5.0
YES	210	82.4	147	93.0	2	100.0	31	88.6	37	92.5
NO RESPONSE	6	2.4	1	0.6	0	0	1	2.9	1	2.5
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE V.20A: ARE TEACHERS COMMITTED TO PRESENT SCHOOL?
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STRONG COMMITMENT TO SCHOOL										
NO	48	22.7	10	15.4	21	13.3	2	20.0	13	12.5
YES	160	75.8	53	81.5	132	83.5	7	70.0	87	83.7
NO RESPONSE	3	1.4	2	3.1	5	3.2	1	10.0	4	3.8
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

TABLE V.20B: ARE PRINCIPALS COMMITTED TO PRESENT SCHOOL?
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STRONG COMMITMENT TO SCHOOL								
NO	3	3.0	1	1.8	1	5.3	1	5.6
YES	95	96.0	54	98.2	15	78.9	17	94.4
NO RESPONSE	1	1.0	0	0	3	15.8	0	0
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0

TABLE V.20B: ARE PRINCIPALS COMMITTED TO PRESENT SCHOOL?
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STRONG COMMITMENT TO SCHOOL										
YES	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0

4. Willingness to Become an Educator Again

School personnel were asked the question: If you could go back to your college days and start over again, would you become an educator? They were asked to choose from among responses ranging from 'certainly would' to 'certainly would not' (see Tables V.21A-B). The results show a marked difference between the public and private sectors. The majority of teachers and principals in the private sector selected the 'certainly would' or 'probably would' become educators again categories. Percentages selecting these two categories ranged from 60% of other religious secondary teachers to 100% of Catholic parochial secondary prinicipals. In contrast, 44%-48% of public school teachers and public elementary principals selected these first two categories. Only a majority of public secondary school principals (70%) said they certainly or probably would become educators again.

The differences become even more dramatic when we look at the percentages of teachers and principals choosing the 'probably would not' and 'certainly would not' categories. Betweewn 33% and 39% of public school teachers and elementary principals selected these last two categories. However, the percentages of personnel in the private sector who indicated they probably or certainly would not become educators again ranged from 4% of Catholic parochial elementary principals to 20% of other religious teachers. In general, secondary school teachers in the public, other religious and Catholic parochial sectors were the most reluctant to become educators again.

TABLE V.21A: WILLINGNESS TO BECOME AN EDUCATOR AGAIN: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
WOULD YOU BECOME EDUCATOR AGAIN?										
CERTAINLY WOULD	66	25.9	70	44.3	1	50.0	18	51.4	14	35.0
PROBABLY WOULD	47	18.4	50	31.6	0	0	7	20.0	12	30.0
CHANCES EVEN	43	16.9	22	13.9	0	0	3	8.6	6	15.0
PROBABLY WOULD NOT	62	24.3	15	9.5	1	50.0	6	17.1	7	17.5
CERTAINLY WOULD NOT	32	12.5	1	0.6	0	0	1	2.9	0	0
NO RESPONSE	5	2.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.5
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE V.21A: WILLINGNESS TO BECOME AN EDUCATOR AGAIN: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
WOULD YOU BECOME EDUCATOR AGAIN?										
CERTAINLY WOULD	42	19.9	26	40.0	53	33.5	1	10.0	39	37.5
PROBABLY WOULD	59	28.0	21	32.3	50	31.6	5	50.0	29	27.9
CHANCES EVEN	26	12.3	10	15.4	28	17.7	2	20.0	21	20.2
PROBABLY WOULD NOT	47	22.3	7	10.8	23	14.6	1	10.0	13	12.5
CERTAINLY WOULD NOT	35	16.6	1	1.5	3	1.9	1	10.0	1	1.0
NO RESPONSE	2	0.9	0	0	1	0.6	0	0	1	1.0
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

TABLE V.21B: WILLINGNESS TO BECOME AN EDUCATOR AGAIN: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
WOULD YOU BECOME EDUCATOR AGAIN?								
CERTAINLY WOULD	22	22.2	34	61.8	10	52.6	3	16.7
PROBABLY WOULD	24	24.2	16	29.1	4	21.1	8	44.4
CHANCES EVEN	19	19.2	2	3.6	2	10.5	4	22.2
PROBABLY WOULD NOT	21	21.2	1	1.8	3	15.8	2	11.1
CERTAINLY WOULD NOT	12	12.1	1	1.8	0	0	0	0
NO RESPONSE	1	1.0	1	1.8	0	0	1	5.6
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0

TABLE V.21B: WILLINGNESS TO BECOME AN EDUCATOR AGAIN: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
WOULD YOU BECOME EDUCATOR AGAIN?										
CERTAINLY WOULD	24	38.1	4	66.7	5	71.4	1	100.0	2	20.0
PROBABLY WOULD	20	31.7	2	33.3	1	14.3	0	0	5	50.0
CHANCES EVEN	7	11.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	20.0
PROBABLY WOULD NOT	8	12.7	0	0	1	14.3	0	0	1	10.0
CERTAINLY WOULD NOT	4	6.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0

5. Alternative Positions Educators Would Choose

School personnel were asked to respond to the question : If given a choice for next year, which of the following would you choose? Working in 1) your current position; 2) a smiliar position in a different school or district, but the same sector; 3) a similar position in a different sector; 4) a different occupation. We simplified these responses into two categories -- those choosing their current position and those choosing a different position.

The majority of teachers and principals in all sectors indicated they would choose their current position (see Tables V.22A-B). Percentages of principals, particularly secondary, which ranged between 74% and 100% were in most cases slightly higher than percentages for teachers in respective categories which were between 61% and 83%. The most striking comparisons were between public and private school teachers. The lowest percentages of teachers choosing their same position were found in the public sector -- 61% for elementary and 63% for secondary.

TABLE V.22A: POSITIONS TEACHERS WOULD CHOOSE IF GIVEN THE CHOICE
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CHOICE OF POSITION FOR NEXT YEAR										
CURRENT POSITION	156	61.2	123	77.8	1	50.0	25	71.4	29	72.5
DIFFERENT POSITION	92	36.1	34	21.6	1	50.0	10	28.6	7	17.5
NO RESPONSE	7	2.7	1	0.6	0	0	0	0	4	10.0
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE V.22A: POSITIONS TEACHERS WOULD CHOOSE IF GIVEN THE CHOICE
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CHOICE OF POSITION FOR NEXT YEAR										
CURRENT POSITION	133	63.0	54	83.1	111	70.3	7	70.0	71	68.3
DIFFERENT POSITION	72	34.2	10	15.4	43	27.2	3	30.0	31	29.8
NO RESPONSE	6	2.8	1	1.5	4	2.5	0	0	2	1.9
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

TABLE V.22B: POSITIONS PRINCIPALS WOULD CHOOSE IF GIVEN THE CHOICE
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CHOICE OF POSITION FOR NEXT YEAR								
CURRENT POSITION	80	80.8	50	90.9	14	73.7	17	94.4
DIFFERENT POSITION	18	18.2	5	9.1	4	21.1	1	5.6
NO RESPONSE	1	1.0	0	0	1	5.3	0	0
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0

TABLE V.22B: POSITIONS PRINCIPALS WOULD CHOOSE IF GIVEN THE CHOICE
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CHOICE OF POSITION FOR NEXT YEAR										
CURRENT POSITION	55	87.3	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	9	90.0
DIFFERENT POSITION	8	12.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	[illegible]	[illegible]
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0

6. Job Mobility

The majority of teachers and principals in all sectors except other religious elementary teachers indicated that their job mobility was not limited by their spouses' jobs, educational plans, or preferences (see Tables V.23A-B). The job mobility of elementary school teachers appeared to be the most affected by their spouses. Between 37% and 63% of elementary teachers indicated their job moblity was limited by their spouses'jobs, etc. Percentages among secondary teachers so responding ranged from 10% of other religious to 34% of Catholic Private school teachers.

The job mobility of principals was, with the exception of public secondary, even less limited by their spouses' preferences. Between 60% and 90% of elementary and secondary school principals stated their job mobility was not limited by their spouses. The job mobility of public school principals appeared to be more limited by their spouses than did that of private school principals. Thirty percent of public elementary and 37% of public secondary principals stated their job mobility was affected by their spouses.

TABLE V.23A: JOB MOBILITY LIMITED BY SPOUSE: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
JOB MOBILITY LIMITED BY SPOUSE										
NO	149	58.4	79	50.0	2	100.0	11	31.4	20	50.0
YES	95	37.3	62	39.2	0	0	22	62.9	17	42.5
NO RESPONSE	11	4.3	17	10.8	0	0	2	5.7	3	7.5
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE V.23A: JOB MOBILITY LIMITED BY SPOUSE: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
JOB MOBILITY LIMITED BY SPOUSE										
NO	152	72.0	49	75.4	98	62.0	7	70.0	67	64.4
YES	57	27.0	12	18.5	53	33.5	1	10.0	32	30.8
NO RESPONSE	2	0.9	4	6.2	7	4.4	2	20.0	5	4.8
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

TABLE V.23B: JOB MOBILITY LIMITED BY SPOUSE: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
JOB MOBILITY LIMITED BY SPOUSE								
NO	68	68.7	46	83.6	14	73.7	15	83.3
YES	30	30.3	5	9.1	5	26.3	3	16.7
NO RESPONSE	1	1.0	4	7.3	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0

TABLE V.23B: JOB MOBILITY LIMITED BY SPOUSE: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
JOB MOBILITY LIMITED BY SPOUSE										
NO	38	60.3	5	83.3	5	71.4	1	100.0	9	90.0
YES	23	36.5	0	0	1	14.3	0	0	1	10.0
NO RESPONSE	2	3.2	1	16.7	1	14.3	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0

E . Employment Information

1. Total Employment Experience

In an effort to determine how teachers' and principals' employment experiences were divided between different kinds of jobs, we asked school personnel to divide their total number of years of work experience among the general job categories listed in Tables V.24A-B. An interesting result was the small overlap between public and private sectors. On average, personnel rarely spent more than 1 or 2 years as teachers or administrators in a sector different from their present one. Furthermore, they spent, on average only 1 to 3 years working in employment outside the field of education. Three exceptions to this pattern are Catholic private elementary teachers (4 years), and other religious elementary and secondary principals (4 and 10 years, respectively).

Both elementary and secondary public school teachers taught more years, an average of 14 and 15 years, respectively, than teachers in other sectors. Mean years of teaching experience among private school teachers ranged from 2 years in other religious secondary to 10 years in Catholic parochial secondary schools. Work experience patterns for principals show less disparity between the public and private sectors. For principals in all categories except non-sectarian elementary, the average years of teaching and administrative experience ranged from 19 years in other religious elementary to 23 years in public secondary schools. Administrative experience alone ranged from 7-10 years in private schools (excluding nonsectarian) to 12-14 years for public school principals. The nonsectarian school principals are an anomaly. Nonsectarian elementary principals had the fewest number of years of administrative experience (7); nonsectarian secondary principals had, on average, the most years of administrative experience (16).

TABLE V.24A: TOTAL YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
TOTAL YRS AS PRIVATE SCH TEACHER	MEAN	1.0	7.2	4.0	6.1	7.2
TOTAL YRS AS PRIVATE SCH ADMINISTRATOR	MEAN	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.1	0.7
TOTAL YRS AS PRIVATE SCH,OTHER PROF	MEAN	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.2
TOTAL YRS AS PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHER	MEAN	14.2	1.8	0.0	1.2	2.1
TOTAL YRS AS PUBLIC SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR	MEAN	0.8	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL YRS AS PRIVATE SCH,OTHER PROF	MEAN	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.2
TOTAL YRS,NON-EDUC EMPLOYT,PROF-TECH-MGR	MEAN	0.9	0.9	0.0	1.1	1.7
TOTAL YRS,NON-EDUC EMPL,OTHER	MEAN	0.7	0.6	4.0	1.0	0.6

TABLE V.24A: TOTAL YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
TOTAL YRS AS PRIVATE SCH TEACHER	MEAN	1.0	9.9	8.5	2.4	7.4
TOTAL YRS AS PRIVATE SCH ADMINISTRATOR	MEAN	0.0	1.8	1.2	1.5	1.3
TOTAL YRS AS PRIVATE SCH,OTHER PROF	MEAN	0.0	0.8	0.9	0.3	0.2
TOTAL YRS AS PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHER	MEAN	14.7	1.2	1.4	0.0	1.3
TOTAL YRS AS PUBLIC SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR	MEAN	0.5	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.2
TOTAL YRS AS PRIVATE SCH,OTHER PROF	MEAN	0.0	0.8	0.9	0.3	0.2
TOTAL YRS,NON-EDUC EMPLOYT,PROF-TECH-MGR	MEAN	1.5	1.5	1.2	0.6	1.5
TOTAL YRS,NON-EDUC EMPL,OTHER	MEAN	1.0	0.4	0.8	0.8	0.6

TABLE V.24B: TOTAL YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE			
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
TOTAL YRS AS PRIVATE SCH TEACHER	MEAN	0.4	13.4	8.5	4.9
TOTAL YRS AS PRIVATE SCH ADMINISTRATOR	MEAN	0.2	9.4	11.3	7.1
TOTAL YRS AS PRIVATE SCH,OTHER PROF	MEAN	0.0	0.2	0.4	0.3
TOTAL YRS AS PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHER	MEAN	10.2	0.4	1.6	3.6
TOTAL YRS AS PUBLIC SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR	MEAN	12.1	0.0	1.2	0.9
TOTAL YRS AS PRIVATE SCH,OTHER PROF	MEAN	0.0	0.2	0.4	0.3
TOTAL YRS,NON-EDUC EMPLOYT,PROF-TECH-MGR	MEAN	0.8	0.9	3.6	1.0
TOTAL YRS,NON-EDUC EMPL,OTHER	MEAN	1.0	0.5	0.3	0.5

TABLE V.24B: TOTAL YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
TOTAL YRS AS PRIVATE SCH TEACHER	MEAN	0.5	8.5	12.1	14.0	6.1
TOTAL YRS AS PRIVATE SCH ADMINISTRATOR	MEAN	0.2	10.5	9.0	7.0	15.7
TOTAL YRS AS PRIVATE SCH,OTHER PROF	MEAN	0.2	0.8	1.7	0.0	0.0
TOTAL YRS AS PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHER	MEAN	8.8	0.0	0.7	0.0	1.7
TOTAL YRS AS PUBLIC SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR	MEAN	14.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
TOTAL YRS AS PRIVATE SCH,OTHER PROF	MEAN	0.2	0.8	1.7	0.0	0.0
TOTAL YRS,NON-EDUC EMPLOYT,PROF-TECH-MGR	MEAN	1.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.2
TOTAL YRS,NON-EDUC EMPL,OTHER	MEAN	0.3	0.2	0.0	10.0	0.0

2. Number of Years Employed in Present School

On average, public school teachers and principals have been employed in their present schools or school districts longer than personnel in any of the other sectors (see Tables V.25A-B) Sixty-nine percent of elementary and 75% of secondary school teachers in the public sector had been working in their present schools 11 years or more. In contrast, percentages of private school teachers with 11 or more years of experience ranged from 0% for Catholic private and other religious elementary to 26% for Catholic parochial secondary schools. Over eighty percent of the teachers in the other religious category had five or less years of experience in their present schools.

Not surprisingly, principals had more years of experience in their present schools than teachers in the same category. Principals in the public sector still had, on average, considerably more years of experience than their private school peers. For example, 86% of public secondary principals had 11 or more years of experience, compared to 40% of nonsectarian secondary principals. An unusually high proportion of public school principals were employed over 21 years in their present districts: 51% of secondary and 41% of elementary principals.

TABLE V.25A: YEARS OF TEACHING IN PRESENT SYSTEM: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
YEARS EMPLOYED IN PRESENT SCH OR DIST										
0-5 YRS	43	16.9	116	73.4	2	100.0	29	82.9	27	67.5
6-10 YRS	38	14.9	29	18.4	0	0	6	17.1	6	15.0
11-20 YRS	142	55.7	12	7.6	0	0	0	0	6	15.0
21+ YRS	32	12.5	1	0.6	0	0	0	0	1	2.5
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE V.25A: YEARS OF TEACHING IN PRESENT SYSTEM: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
YEARS EMPLOYED IN PRESENT SCH OR DIST										
0-5 YRS	26	12.3	36	55.4	95	60.1	8	80.0	58	55.8
6-10 YRS	27	12.8	12	18.5	39	24.7	2	20.0	29	27.9
11-20 YRS	116	55.0	10	15.4	19	12.0	0	0	15	14.4
21+ YRS	42	19.9	7	10.8	5	3.2	0	0	2	1.9
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

TABLE V.25B: YEARS OF TEACHING IN PRESENT SYSTEM: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
YEARS EMPLOYED IN PRESENT SCH OR DIST								
0-5 YRS	10	10.1	32	58.2	6	31.6	7	38.9
6-10 YRS	8	8.1	15	27.3	6	31.6	4	22.2
11-20 YRS	40	40.4	6	10.9	5	26.3	6	33.3
21+ YRS	41	41.4	2	3.6	2	10.5	1	5.6
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0

TABLE V.25B: YEARS OF TEACHING IN PRESENT SYSTEM: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
YEARS EMPLOYED IN PRESENT SCH OR DIST										
0-5 YRS	4	6.3	3	50.0	4	57.1	1	100.0	2	20.0
6-10 YRS	5	7.9	2	33.3	1	14.3	0	0	4	40.0
11-20 YRS	22	34.9	1	16.7	2	28.6	0	0	3	30.0
21+ YRS	32	50.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10.0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0

3.Percent of Time Employed

We were interested in determining any differences among school types in the use of part-time personnel. School personnel were asked to list what percent of full-time they were employed. The vast majority of personnel were full-time employees (see Tables V.26A-B). Virtually all principals in both public and private sectors responded that they were employed full time. Percentages of teachers employed full-time ranged between 83% of nonsectarian elementary and 96% of public secondary teachers.

The greatest use of part-time employees occured in the private sector. About 14% of other religious, 18% of nonsectarian elementary schools, and 12% of Catholic private secondary schools were part-time employees.

TABLE V.26A : PERCENT OF TIME TEACHERS EMPLOYED
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
PERCENT OF FULL TIME										
<100%	11	4.3	7	4.4	0	0	5	14.3	7	17.5
100%	240	94.1	149	94.3	2	100.0	29	82.9	33	82.5
NO RESPONSE	4	1.6	2	1.3	0	0	1	2.9	0	0
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE V.26A : PERCENT OF TIME TEACHERS EMPLOYED
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
PERCENT OF FULL TIME										
<100%	7	3.3	5	7.7	19	12.0	1	10.0	9	8.7
100%	203	96.2	60	92.3	136	86.1	9	90.0	95	91.3
NO RESPONSE	1	0.5	0	0	3	1.9	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

TABLE V.26B : PERCENT OF TIME PRINCIPALS EMPLOYED
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
PERCENT OF FULL TIME								
100%	98	99.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	17	94.4
NO RESPONSE	1	1.0	0	0	0	0	1	5.6
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0

TABLE V.26B : PERCENT OF TIME PRINCIPALS EMPLOYED
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
PERCENT OF FULL TIME										
100%	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0

4. Years Unemployed or on Leave

Tables V.27A-B demonstrate the number of years male and female teachers and principals were unemployed or on leave after becoming educators. In general, male teachers and principals were unemployed or on leave for less time than their female counterparts. This result can probably be attributed in part to leaves of absence for pregnancy. Principals, even in Catholic schools where the majority of responding principals were female, were unemployed for less time than teachers.

Relatively large percentages of female teachers, particularly at the elementary level, were unemployed from 0 to 5 years. For example, 17% to 30% of the total number of elementary teachers were females with 0 to 5 years unemployment or leave; only 1% to 5% of this same group were males with similar time off. The majority of nonsectarian elementary teachers had been unemployed for various amounts of time during their teaching careers; 20% of the total respondents were females who were unemployed more than 11 years.

Secondary school teachers were unemployed less time than were elementary teachers. This was due primarily to increases in the number of male teachers, who generally take less leave, at this level. We noticed that the percentages of female secondary school teachers who took leaves of absence were greater than the percentages of female teachers who had been unemployed at the elementary level. For example, 60% of the female public elementary school respondents had been unemployed or on leave; only 72% percent of female public secondary school teachers had been similarly unemployed or on leave. Thus, the main factor affecting this descrease in the number of secondary school teachers unemployed or on leave is an increase in the number of males.

TABLE V.27A: YEARS UNEMPLOYED OR ON LEAVE: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
		PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TEACHER'S SEX	YRS UNEMPLOYED SINCE BECOMING EDUCATOR										
FEMALE	0	96	37.6	83	52.5	2	100.0	15	42.9	13	32.5
	1-5	50	19.6	36	22.8	0	0	6	17.1	12	30.0
	6-10	15	5.9	12	7.6	0	0	4	11.4	2	5.0
	11+	30	11.8	13	8.2	0	0	3	8.6	8	20.0
MALE	0	54	21.2	10	6.3	0	0	6	17.1	2	5.0
	1-5	3	1.2	1	0.6	0	0	0	0	2	5.0
	6-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.5
	11+	1	0.4	1	0.6	0	0	1	2.9	0	0
NO RESPONSE		6	2.4	2	1.2	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL		255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE V.27A: YEARS UNEMPLOYED OR ON LEAVE: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
		PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TEACHER'S SEX	YRS UNEMPLOYED SINCE BECOMING EDUCATOR										
FEMALE	0	50	23.7	20	30.8	60	38.0	3	30.0	34	32.7
	1-5	27	12.8	4	6.2	27	17.1	1	10.0	9	8.7
	6-10	3	1.4	0	0	9	5.7	0	0	7	6.7
	11+	4	1.9	2	3.1	8	5.1	0	0	3	2.9
MALE	0	103	48.8	34	52.3	46	29.1	5	50.0	38	36.5
	1-5	16	7.6	5	7.7	4	2.5	1	10.0	6	5.8
	6-10	0	0	0	0	1	0.6	0	0	0	0
	11+	6	2.8	0	0	1	0.6	0	0	4	3.8
NO RESPONSE		2	0.9	0	0	2	1.3	0	0	3	2.9
TOTAL		211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

TABLE V.27B: YEARS UNEMPLOYED OR ON LEAVE: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
		PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TEACHER'S SEX	YRS UNEMPLOYED SINCE BECOMING EDUCATOR								
FEMALE	0	18	18.2	46	83.6	3	15.8	8	44.4
	1-5	8	8.1	1	1.8	2	10.5	4	22.2
	6-10	1	1.0	2	3.6	0	0	0	0
	11+	1	1.0	1	1.8	0	0	0	0
MALE	0	61	61.6	5	9.1	14	73.7	4	22.2
	0.5	2	2.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1-5	6	6.1	0	0	0	0	2	11.1
	11+	2	2.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL		99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0

TABLE V.27B: YEARS UNEMPLOYED OR ON LEAVE: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
		PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TEACHER'S SEX	YRS UNEMPLOYED SINCE BECOMING EDUCATOR										
FEMALE	0	10	15.9	2	33.3	4	57.1	0	0	0	0
	1-5	1	1.6	0	0	1	14.3	0	0	0	0
	6-10	1	1.6	0	0	1	14.3	0	0	0	0
	11+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10.0
MALE	0	45	71.4	4	66.7	1	14.3	0	0	8	80.0
	1-5	2	3.2	0	0	0	0	1	100.0	1	10.0
	11+	4	6.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL		63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0

5. Type of Job Assignment

The primary and secondary job assignments listed by teachers and principals were categorized in the following manner: self-contained, departmentalized, vocational education, special education, school adminstration or student support staff (see Tables V.28A-B). It is interesting to note that the percentages of nonrespondents was much greater for secondary rather than primary job assignments, particularly in public schools. The data suggest, but clearly do not conclude, that personnel in the private sector have more secondary job assignments.

The primary job assignments listed by teachers and principals were quite predictable. The majority of elementary school teachers in all sectors (60%-77%) had primary job assignments in self-contained classrooms; the majority of secondary teachers' primary assignments were in departmentalized settings (50%-70%). The primary job assignments of secondary teachers showed more diversity. Many individuals were involved primarily in student support services, school administration, and vocational education.

The vast majority of prinicipals, 100% of secondary, indicated their primary job assignment was school administration. In the category other religious elementary, 21% of the principals listed primary job assignments in self-contained or departmentalized classrooms. A greater percentage of public school teachers had primary job assignments in special and vocational education and administration. Very few elementary or secondary teachers in the private sector (less than 1%) had either primary or secondary job assignments in special education.

The pattern of secondary job assignments showed surprising consistency among the different groups. The most common secondary job assignments for all groups, in order of frequency, were departmentalized teaching, self-contained teaching for elementary teachers, school administration and student support services.

TABLE V.28A : JOB ASSIGNMENT OF TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CODE FOR PRIMARY JOB ASSIGNMENT										
SELF-CONTAINED	153	60.0	115	72.8	1	50.0	27	77.1	29	72.5
DEPARTMENTALIZED	31	12.2	31	19.6	1	50.0	5	14.3	7	17.5
SPECIAL EDUCATION	21	8.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION	3	1.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SCH ADMIN	9	3.5	4	2.5	0	0	0	0	1	2.5
STUDENT SUPPORT	23	9.0	2	1.3	0	0	1	2.9	0	0
NO RESPONSE	15	5.9	6	3.8	0	0	2	5.7	3	7.5
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0
CODE FOR FIRST SECONDARY JOB ASSIGNMENT										
SELF-CONTAINED	8	3.1	13	8.2	0	0	2	5.7	6	15.0
DEPARTMENTALIZED	14	5.5	26	16.5	1	50.0	6	17.1	8	20.0
SPECIAL EDUCATION	2	0.8	1	0.6	0	0	0	0	0	0
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION	1	0.4	1	0.6	0	0	0	0	0	0
ADULT EDUCATION	0	0	1	0.6	0	0	0	0	0	0
SCH ADMIN	1	0.4	13	8.2	0	0	1	2.9	3	7.5
STUDENT SUPPORT	2	0.8	2	1.3	0	0	2	5.7	0	0
NO RESPONSE	227	89.0	101	63.9	1	50.0	24	68.6	23	57.5
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE V.28A : JOB ASSIGNMENT OF TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CODE FOR PRIMARY JOB ASSIGNMENT										
SELF-CONTAINED	8	3.8	1	1.5	2	1.3	1	10.0	3	2.9
DEPARTMENTALIZED	124	58.8	42	64.6	103	65.2	5	50.0	73	70.2
SPECIAL EDUCATION	10	4.7	0	0	1	0.6	0	0	0	0
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION	24	11.4	3	4.6	9	5.7	0	0	1	1.0
SCH ADMIN	9	4.3	6	9.2	16	10.1	1	10.0	12	11.5
STUDENT SUPPORT	17	8.1	7	10.8	17	10.8	2	20.0	5	4.8
NO RESPONSE	19	9.0	6	9.2	10	6.3	1	10.0	10	9.6
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0
CODE FOR FIRST SECONDARY JOB ASSIGNMENT										
SELF-CONTAINED	0	0	0	0	2	1.3	0	0	0	0
DEPARTMENTALIZED	48	22.7	22	33.8	36	22.8	3	30.0	31	29.8
SPECIAL EDUCATION	1	0.5	0	0	1	0.6	0	0	1	1.0
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION	6	2.8	2	3.1	6	3.8	0	0	1	1.0
SCH ADMIN	16	7.6	11	16.9	22	13.9	1	10.0	15	14.4
STUDENT SUPPORT	10	4.7	4	6.2	16	10.1	1	10.0	10	9.6
NO RESPONSE	130	61.6	26	40.0	75	47.5	5	50.0	46	44.2
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

TABLE V.28B : JOB ASSIGNMENT OF PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CODE FOR PRIMARY JOB ASSIGNMENT								
SELF-CONTAINED	3	3.0	0	0	3	15.8	0	0
DEPARTMENTALIZED	0	0	0	0	1	5.3	0	0
SPECIAL EDUCATION	1	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SCH ADMIN	90	90.9	51	92.7	15	78.9	16	88.9
NO RESPONSE	5	5.1	4	7.3	0	0	2	11.1
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0
CODE FOR FIRST SECONDARY JOB ASSIGNMENT								
SELF-CONTAINED	1	1.0	4	7.3	2	10.5	2	11.1
DEPARTMENTALIZED	0	0	5	9.1	3	15.8	2	11.1
SPECIAL EDUCATION	0	0	1	1.8	0	0	0	0
SCH ADMIN	7	7.1	4	7.3	4	21.1	0	0
STUDENT SUPPORT	1	1.0	1	1.8	1	5.3	1	5.6
NO RESPONSE	90	90.9	40	72.7	9	47.4	13	72.2
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0

TABLE V.28B : JOB ASSIGNMENT OF PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CODE FOR PRIMARY JOB ASSIGNMENT										
SCH ADMIN	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	0	0	10	100.0
NO RESPONSE	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100.0	0	0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0
CODE FOR FIRST SECONDARY JOB ASSIGNMENT										
DEPARTMENTALIZED	0	0	1	16.7	2	28.6	0	0	1	10.0
SCH ADMIN	2	3.2	0	0	1	14.3	0	0	0	0
STUDENT SUPPORT	1	1.6	0	0	1	14.3	0	0	1	10.0
NO RESPONSE	60	95.2	5	83.3	3	42.9	1	100.0	8	80.0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0

6.Percent of Time Spent on Subjects for which not Formally Trained

Tables V.29 show the mean percent of time teachers in the various school types spent teaching subjects for which they were not formally trained. With two exceptions, teachers spent less than 15% of their time teaching subjects for which they were not formally trained. The two exceptions were Catholic private and nonsectarian elementary teachers who spect 29% and 22% of their time, respectively, teaching subjects outside the area of their formal training.

At the elementary level, public school teachers spent slightly smaller percentages of their time teaching subjects for which they were not formally trained compared to those in the private sector. Secondary school teachers revealed no clear pattern.

TABLE V.29

Percent of Time Teaching Outside Area of Training
(Grade Level = Elementary)

	Classification of School Type					
	Public	Catholic Parochial	Catholic Private	Other Religious	Non-Sectarian	Overall
Mean % of Time	8.2	13.8	28.9	9.39	21.9	9.55

Percent of Time Teaching Outside Area of Training
(Grade Level = Secondary)

	Classification of School Type					
	Public	Catholic Parochial	Catholic Private	Other Religious	Non-Sectarian	Overall
Mean % of Time	10.8	13.5	8.4	3.8	12.1	10.7

F. Terms of Employment

1. Contract Year

Teachers and principals were asked how many days per year they were required to work under their employment contract, including paid holidays. Teachers averaged between 182 and 224 days of work a year; principals averaged between 200 and 270 days per year. (see Tables V.30A-B). Other religious and nonsectarian school teachers averaged more work days than their public and Catholic school peers. Contract years for public school teachers were the shortest -- 182 for elementary and 184 for secondary. At the elementary level, nonsectarian (255 days) and other religious school (267 days) principals had longer contract years; at the secondary level, catholic parochial and nonsectarian principals worked more days -- 231 and 270, respectively.

TABLE V.30A: CONTRACT YEAR: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
DAYS OF WORK PER YEAR	MEAN	181.7	184.9	178.0	224.4	191.5

TABLE V.30A: CONTRACT YEAR: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
DAYS OF WORK PER YEAR	MEAN	184.5	186.9	191.8	219.4	203.7

TABLE V.30B: CONTRACT YEAR: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE			
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
DAYS OF WORK PER YEAR	MEAN	209.9	199.9	266.4	255.5

TABLE V.30B: CONTRACT YEAR: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
DAYS OF WORK PER YEAR	MEAN	214.4	230.5	208.0	232.0	269.5

2. Weekly Workload

Public school teachers were asked how many hours a week they spent in the following school related activities: teaching, supervising students (study hall, lunch, etc.), class preparation, and extra-curricular activities for which they were compensated. Private school teachers were asked additional questions about school related events for which they received no compensation and tutoring individual students outside of normal class time. Teachers reported the results in hours and minutes, not class periods. Therefore, a teacher who had five 50 minute class periods a day would teach about 20 hours per week (see Tables V.31).

All teachers spent the bulk of their time in teaching and class preparation. Public school teachers reported spending about 20 hours a week teaching, and 10 hours a week in class preparation. Private elementary school teachers averaged 18 to 20 hours teaching and 7 to 10 hours in class preparation. Private secondary teachers, however, averaged between 12 and 15 hours teaching and 7 to 12 hours in class preparation. These teachers spent between 3 and 5 hours a week on school related activites for which they were not compensated, and about 2 hours a week tutoring. All groups spent about 2 to 5 hours supervising students.

Principals were asked how they allocated their time between administrative activities, teaching, and supervising students. The questionnaire for private school administrators included an additional category: school related activites for which they received no extra compensation. Principals in both sectors spent the majority of their time, 32 to 50 hours per week, in administrative activities. The results show that nonpublic school principals spent more time than public school principals in teaching duties. Other religious elementary principals spent 14 hours a week teaching, compared to between 1 and 5 hours in the other sectors. Public secondary principals spent, on average, 12 hours a week supervising students; private secondary principals spent between 0 and 5 hours.

TABLE V.31A: HOURS PER WEEK IN SCHOOL RELATED ACTIVITIES:
TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
HRS/WK OF TEACHING TIME	MEAN	21.1	15.3	14.8	12.0	14.9
HRS/WK OF SUPERVISING STUDENTS	MEAN	3.8	5.2	2.4	1.5	2.3
HRS/WK OF CLASS PREPARATION	MEAN	9.9	9.2	9.2	6.8	12.4
HRS/WK OF EXTRA CURR ACTIVITIES	MEAN	3.8	6.5	5.9	8.2	2.5
SCHOOL RELATED ACTIVITIES, HRS PER WEEK	MEAN	N/A	5.6	4.4	2.8	4.0
TUTORING INDIVID STDNTS, HRS PER WEEK	MEAN	N/A	1.9	1.9	1.7	3.1

TABLE V.31A: HOURS PER WEEK IN SCHOOL RELATED ACTIVITIES: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
HRS/WK OF TEACHING TIME	MEAN	20.1	19.9	10.7	17.7	18.6
HRS/WK OF SUPERVISING STUDENTS	MEAN	1.5	2.3	1.9	2.2	3.8
HRS/WK OF CLASS PREPARATION	MEAN	9.7	9.8	17.5	8.4	6.9
HRS/WK OF EXTRA CURR ACTIVITIES	MEAN	0.7	1.2	0.0	1.5	0.2
SCHOOL RELATED ACTIVITIES, HRS PER WEEK	MEAN	N/A	3.4	0.6	3.0	2.5
TUTORING INDIVID STDNTS, HRS PER WEEK	MEAN	N/A	1.5	0.0	0.6	1.0

TABLE V.31B: HOURS PER WEEK IN SCHOOL RELATED ACTIVITIES: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE			
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
HRS/WK OF TEACHING TIME	MEAN	1.4	2.5	13.6	5.1
HRS/WK OF SUPERVISING STUDENTS	MEAN	5.0	5.1	5.4	1.1
HRS OF ADMIN DUTIES FOR PRINCIPALS	MEAN	37.5	40.9	33.6	36.4

TABLE V.31B: HOURS PER WEEK IN SCHOOL RELATED ACTIVITIES: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
HRS/WK OF TEACHING TIME	MEAN	0.0	2.9	4.2	N/A	2.3
HRS/WK OF SUPERVISING STUDENTS	MEAN	12.0	5.0	3.0	N/A	0.0
HRS OF ADMIN DUTIES FOR PRINCIPALS	MEAN	42.7	39.2	46.1	50.0	42.6

3. Average Class Size and Number of Students Taught on an Average Day

Teachers in elementary and secondary schools were asked -- What is your average class size? Mean class sizes for nonsectarian schools were the smallest -- 15 for secondary and 19 for elementary. Catholic parochial elementary school teachers reported the largest classes -- 34 students. Mean class sizes for the other categories ranged from 23 to 30 students (see Tables V.32).

The results of the question -- How many pupils do you teach on an average day? -- show similar patterns (see Tables V.33). Non-sectarian teachers taught fewer students on an average day -- 36 elementary and 54 secondary students. At the elementary level, Catholic parochial teachers taught more students per day (65); at the secondary level, public school teachers had more students (125). Note the dramatic increase in the number of secondary school students taught on an average day. Means for pupils taught per day ranged from 36 to 62 at the elementary level and from 54 to 125 at the secondary level.

TABLE V.32: AVERAGE CLASS SIZE OF TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
AVERAGE CLASS SIZE	MEAN	26.4	33.4	22.5	22.6	18.7

TABLE V.32: AVERAGE CLASS SIZE OF TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
AVERAGE CLASS SIZE	MEAN	28.7	29.8	29.9	22.5	15.0

TABLE V.33: NUMBER OF PUPILS TAUGHT BY TEACHERS PER DAY
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
TOTAL PUPILS TAUGHT ON AVG DAY	MEAN	51.6	64.8	60.0	46.2	35.8

TABLE V.33: NUMBER OF PUPILS TAUGHT BY TEACHERS PER DAY
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
TOTAL PUPILS TAUGHT ON AVG DAY	MEAN	125.3	112.0	111.0	85.0	54.3

4. Discipline Problems

Teachers and principals were asked which of the following general descriptions of school-wide disciplinary problems were most representative of their schools: no serious problems, disregard for school rules, poor attendance, drug and alcohol abuse, theft and/or vandalism, fighting among students, and violent acts against faculty (see Tables V.34A-B) . Except for Catholic elementary and nonsectarian secondary schools where teachers and principals had similar perceptions on discipline problems, principals reported fewer discipline problems than did their teachers. For example, 62% of public secondary principals reported no serious discipline problems, but only 29% of public secondary teachers had the same perception. One hundred percent of Catholic secondary school principals checked the category 'no serious problems' compared to 70%-80% of their teachers. These differences may result from differences in the number of principals and teachers responding, or may be legitimate differences in perceptions.

Another notable result is the difference between public and private school reponses. Both teachers and principals in private schools reported fewer discipline problems than did those in public schools. At the elementary level, 58% of public school teachers reported no serious problems compared to 85%-88% in the other categories (excluding Catholic private). At the secondary level, only 29% of public school teachers said there were no serious discipline problems compared to 68%-88% of the private school teachers.

The two most common discipline problems reported by public school personnel were disregard for school rules and poor attendance. Poor attendance was the major discipline problem for public secondary schools: 36% percent of teachers and 24% of principals cited this as a problem. The discipline problems most commonly reported by private school teachers were disregard for school rules, fighting among students at the elementary level, and interestingly, drug and alcohol abuse at the secondary level. Between 4% and 10% of private school teachers said alcohol and drug abuse were problems, compared to just 2% of public school teachers. In stark contrast, no private secondary principals and 3% of public secondary principals viewed drug and alcohol abuse as problems. A larger percentage of public school (11%) than private school (0%-3%) teachers considered theft and/or vandalism and fighting among secondary students a problem.

TABLE V.34A: DISCIPLINE PROBLEMS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TYPICAL SCHOOL DISCIPLINARY PROBLEMS										
NO SERIOUS PROBLEMS	147	57.6	134	84.8	1	50.0	30	85.7	35	87.5
DISREGARD FOR SCH RULES	70	27.5	19	12.0	0	0	4	11.4	4	10.0
POOR ATTENDANCE	13	5.1	3	1.9	0	0	0	0	0	0
DRUG AND ALCOHOL ABUSE	1	0.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
THEFT AND/OR VANDALISM	2	0.8	1	0.6	0	0	0	0	0	0
FIGHTING AMONG STUDENTS	10	3.9	1	0.6	1	50.0	1	2.9	1	2.5
VIOLENT ACTS AGNST FACULTY	2	0.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NO RESPONSE	10	3.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE V.34A: DISCIPLINE PROBLEMS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TYPICAL SCHOOL DISCIPLINARY PROBLEMS										
NO SERIOUS PROBLEMS	62	29.4	44	67.7	126	79.7	7	70.0	92	88.5
DISREGARD FOR SCH RULES	39	18.5	6	9.2	15	9.5	2	20.0	6	5.8
POOR ATTENDANCE	75	35.5	3	4.6	1	0.6	0	0	0	0
DRUG AND ALCOHOL ABUSE	5	2.4	7	10.8	12	7.6	1	10.0	4	3.8
THEFT AND/OR VANDALISM	12	5.7	3	4.6	4	2.5	0	0	1	1.0
FIGHTING AMONG STUDENTS	10	4.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VIOLENT ACTS AGNST FACULTY	2	0.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NO RESPONSE	6	2.8	2	3.1	0	0	0	0	1	1.0
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

TABLE V.34B: DISCIPLINE PROBLEMS PERCEIVED BY PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TYPICAL SCHOOL DISCIPLINARY PROBLEMS								
NO SERIOUS PROBLEMS	77	77.8	48	87.3	16	84.2	18	100.0
DISREGARD FOR SCH RULES	11	11.1	5	9.1	1	5.3	0	0
POOR ATTENDANCE	5	5.1	0	0	0	0	0	0
THEFT AND/OR VANDALISM	1	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FIGHTING AMONG STUDENTS	3	3.0	2	3.6	1	5.3	0	0
VIOLENT ACTS AGNST FACULTY	1	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NO RESPONSE	1	1.0	0	0	1	5.3	0	0
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0

TABLE V.34B: DISCIPLINE PROBLEMS PERCEIVED BY PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TYPICAL SCHOOL DISCIPLINARY PROBLEMS										
NO SERIOUS PROBLEMS	39	61.9	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	9	90.0
DISREGARD FOR SCH RULES	5	7.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10.0
POOR ATTENDANCE	15	23.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DRUG AND ALCOHOL ABUSE	2	3.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FIGHTING AMONG STUDENTS	1	1.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NO RESPONSE	1	1.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0

5.Availability of Instructional Supplies

The percentages of teachers reporting that supplies were readily available were virtually identical for elementary and secondary levels (see Tables V.35). Differences in availability of supplies appear to occur between public and private sectors. Approximately 75%-80% of private school teachers said they could get the supplies they needed; between 11% and 22% said they had difficulty getting what they needed. In contrast, about 60% of public school teachers said supplies were readily available; close to 30% said they were difficult to get; 7% said they were not available.

TABLE V.35: INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPLIES AVAILABLE TO TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
AVAILABILITY OF INSTR SUPPLIES										
READILY AVAILABLE	160	62.7	119	75.3	2	100.0	29	82.9	33	82.5
DIFFICULT TO GET	68	26.7	34	21.5	0	0	4	11.4	6	15.0
NOT AVAILABLE	18	7.1	4	2.5	0	0	1	2.9	1	2.5
NO RESPONSE	9	3.5	1	0.6	0	0	1	2.9	0	0
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE V.35: INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPLIES AVAILABLE TO TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
AVAILABILITY OF INSTR SUPPLIES										
READILY AVAILABLE	127	60.2	48	73.8	129	81.6	8	80.0	86	82.7
DIFFICULT TO GET	65	30.8	14	21.5	23	14.6	0	0	13	12.5
NOT AVAILABLE	13	6.2	2	3.1	2	1.3	1	10.0	1	1.0
NO RESPONSE	6	2.8	1	1.5	4	2.5	1	10.0	4	3.8
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

6. Availability of Teacher Aides

Teachers were asked how many hours per week of paid or volunteer teacher aid time were available to them (see Tables V.36). In general, elementary teachers received more hours of paid teacher aid time than did secondary teachers; public school teachers received slightly more hours of paid aid than private school teachers. Public elementary teachers received, on average, 9 hours of paid aid per week compared to 5 hours for secondary. Private elementary teachers received 2-8 hours of teacher aide time; less than one hour of paid aid was available to private secondary teachers. Very little volunteer teacher aide time -- 0 to 2 hours -- aid was available to teachers in any sectors.

TABLE V.36: HOURS OF AID TIME TO TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
HRS PER WK OF PAID AIDE TIME	MEAN	9.0	5.0	2.0	8.4	6.2
HRS PER WK OF VOLUNTEER AIDE TIME	MEAN	2.2	1.8	0.0	1.7	1.0

TABLE V.36: HOURS OF AID TIME TO TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE				
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN
HRS PER WK OF PAID AIDE TIME	MEAN	4.6	0.2	0.6	0.5	0.2
HRS PER WK OF VOLUNTEER AIDE TIME	MEAN	1.0	1.2	0.4	0.6	0.4

7.Teachers Organizations

Teachers were asked which of the following teacher organizations they belonged to: California Teachers Association (CTA), American Federation of Teachers (AFT), or other. Close to 90% of public elementary and secondary teachers belonged to the CTA (see Tables V.37). Not surprisingly, less than 11% of private elementary or secondary teachers were members of the CTA. Excluding Catholic parochial secondary teachers of which 28% were AFT members and 6% were members of other organizations, between 79% and 89% of the teachers in the private sector did not belong to any teacher organizations.

TABLE V.37: TEACHER ORGANIZATIONS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CTA, AFT, NONE OR OTHER										
CTA	222	87.1	6	3.8	0	0	0	0	1	2.5
AFT	15	5.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER	8	3.1	5	3.2	0	0	3	8.6	1	2.5
NONE	4	1.6	133	84.2	2	100.0	31	88.6	34	85.0
NO RE	6	2.4	14	8.9	0	0	1	2.9	4	10.0
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE V.37: TEACHER ORGANIZATIONS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CTA, AFT, NONE OR OTHER										
CTA	187	88.6	7	10.8	1	0.6	0	0	2	1.9
AFT	14	6.6	18	27.7	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER	3	1.4	4	6.2	14	8.9	0	0	5	4.8
NONE	0	0	31	47.7	125	79.1	8	80.0	88	84.6
NO RE	7	3.3	5	7.7	18	11.4	2	20.0	9	8.7
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

G. Compensation

1. Gross Annual Salary

Teachers and principals reported their 1981-82 gross annual salary, before taxes and contributed services or donations to their schools. Extra compensation received during the school year for coaching was included; any compensation for summer school was excluded.

Gross annual salaries for teachers and principals in the public sector were higher than those of their counterparts in the private sector (see Tables V.38-39). For example, 89% of public elementary school teachers had gross annual salaries greater than $18,000; 56% of these had salaries between $22,001 and $28,000. In comparison, between 76% and 84% of the private elementary teachers reported gross annual salaries of less than $18,000, with a majority reporting salaries between $10,000 and $18,000. Similar patterns hold true for secondary teachers. Only 7% of public school teachers reported a gross annual salary of less than $18,000, compared to between 54% and 78% of private secondary school teachers reporting salaries in this range. Sixty-four percent of public secondary teachers had salaries between $24,001 and $30,000.

Principals' gross annual salaries were, in general, higher than teachers' salaries; the average secondary principal made more than his or her elementary school counterpart; and, as in the case of teachers, public school principals reported higher salaries. Ninety percent of elementary and 97% of secondary teachers in the public sector made over $30,000 annually. However, only 11% to 41% of elementary and 50% to 60% of secondary principals in the private sector were in this same salary range.

In the private sector, higher percentages of nonsectarian personnel, particularly principals, reported larger salaries. It is interesting to note the skewed distribution of salary ranges among personnel in the Catholic parochial and private schools. For example, 40% of Catholic parochial elementary principals reported a gross annual salary in the $4,000 - $8,000 range; 26% of this same group made over $35,000. These results may be due to the small number of respondents.

TABLE V.38A: GROSS ANNUAL SALARY: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
GROSS ANNUAL SALARY										
0-4000	0	0	2	1.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
4001-8000	0	0	9	6.0	0	0	1	3.4	3	9.1
8001-10000	0	0	15	10.1	1	50.0	3	10.3	0	0
10001-12000	1	0.4	44	29.5	0	0	10	34.5	4	12.1
12001-14000	6	2.5	36	24.2	0	0	9	31.0	6	18.2
14001-16000	6	2.5	13	8.7	1	50.0	1	3.4	6	18.2
16001-18000	13	5.4	3	2.0	0	0	1	3.4	6	18.2
18001-20000	15	6.3	0	0	0	0	2	6.9	3	9.1
20001-22000	22	9.2	1	0.7	0	0	0	0	1	3.0
22001-24000	26	10.8	2	1.3	0	0	1	3.4	0	0
24001-26000	59	24.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.0
26001-28000	48	20.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
28001-30000	18	7.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
30001-35000	11	4.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
35001+	15	6.3	24	16.1	0	0	1	3.4	3	9.1
TOTAL	240	100.0	149	100.0	2	100.0	29	100.0	33	100.0

TABLE V.38A: GROSS ANNUAL SALARY: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
GROSS ANNUAL SALARY										
0-4000	0	0	0	0	3	2.2	0	0	1	1.1
4001-8000	0	0	8	13.3	5	3.7	0	0	0	0
8001-10000	0	0	1	1.7	1	0.7	4	44.4	0	0
10001-12000	2	1.0	0	0	6	4.4	1	11.1	4	4.2
12001-14000	3	1.5	6	10.0	12	8.8	0	0	16	16.8
14001-16000	4	2.0	8	13.3	29	21.3	0	0	14	14.7
16001-18000	6	3.0	10	16.7	16	11.8	2	22.2	16	16.8
18001-20000	8	3.9	4	6.7	22	16.2	0	0	10	10.5
20001-22000	9	4.4	4	6.7	4	2.9	0	0	7	7.4
22001-24000	12	5.9	6	10.0	3	2.2	0	0	7	7.4
24001-26000	33	16.3	4	6.7	10	7.4	0	0	6	6.3
26001-28000	49	24.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.1
28001-30000	49	24.1	0	0	4	2.9	0	0	1	1.1
30001-35000	20	9.9	1	1.7	0	0	0	0	3	3.2
35001+	8	3.9	8	13.3	21	15.4	2	22.2	9	9.5
TOTAL	203	100.0	60	100.0	136	100.0	9	100.0	95	100.0

TABLE V.38B: GROSS ANNUAL SALARY: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
GROSS ANNUAL SALARY								
4001-8000	0	0	22	40.0	0	0	0	0
12001-14000	0	0	1	1.8	0	0	0	0
14001-16000	0	0	2	3.6	1	5.3	0	0
16001-18000	0	0	5	9.1	2	10.5	2	11.8
18001-20000	0	0	7	12.7	5	26.3	2	11.8
20001-22000	1	1.0	3	5.5	4	21.1	2	11.8
22001-24000	0	0	0	0	1	5.3	1	5.9
24001-26000	1	1.0	0	0	3	15.8	2	11.8
26001-28000	1	1.0	0	0	1	5.3	1	5.9
28001-30000	7	7.1	1	1.8	0	0	0	0
30001-35000	48	49.0	0	0	0	0	1	5.9
35001+	40	40.8	14	25.5	2	10.5	6	35.3
TOTAL	98	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	17	100.0

TABLE V.38B: GROSS ANNUAL SALARY: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
GROSS ANNUAL SALARY										
0-4000	0	0	0	0	1	14.3	0	0	0	0
4001-8000	0	0	3	50.0	3	42.9	0	0	0	0
10001-12000	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100.0	0	0
16001-18000	0	0	0	0	1	14.3	0	0	0	0
20001-22000	0	0	0	0	1	14.3	0	0	0	0
22001-24000	0	0	0	0	1	14.3	0	0	0	0
24001-26000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	30.0
28001-30000	2	3.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10.0
30001-35000	12	19.0	1	16.7	0	0	0	0	0	0
35001+	49	77.8	2	33.3	0	0	0	0	6	60.0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0

2.Fringe Benefits

School personnel were asked which of the following fringe benefits they received in addition to their annual salary: general medical, dental, group life, and professional liability insurance. Answers were reported strictly in a yes or no format; therefore, comparisons drawn between groups are on a numerical basis rather than on a dollar value of the fringe beneifts.

In general, greater percentages of public school personnel received partial or full medical and dental coverage, particularly dental coverage, than did private school personnel(see Tables V.39A-B). With the exception of other religious secondary school teachers, greater percentages of public school personnel received full medical or dental coverage. The majority of personnel in all sectors -- 55% to 100% -- received partial or full general medical coverage. Between 86% and 96% of public school personnel received both medical and dental coverage. Dental coverage for private school personnel was not as common; 10% to 62% reported no dental insurance as a fringe benefit.

Patterns for group life and professional liability insurance were less consistent. In general, both types of insurance were reported less frequently as a fringe benefit than medical or dental coverage. Over 60% of teachers and principals in all categories except nonsectarian and Catholic parochial secondary principals reported no professional liability coverage. The majority of teachers in each category except other religious secondary did not have any group life insurance.

Principals, particularly at the secondary level, appeared to have more fringe benefits than teachers in their same sectors. These results are inconclusive because of small numbers of respondents in many categories. Nonsectarian elementary teachers appeared to have, overall, the fewest fringe benefits of any group.

TABLE V.39A: FRINGE BENEFITS: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
INSUR COVRG BY EMPLOYER, GENERAL MEDICAL										
NONE	29	11.4	19	12.0	0	0	12	34.3	17	42.5
PARTIAL	52	20.4	53	33.5	2	100.0	7	20.0	7	17.5
FULL	166	65.1	71	44.9	0	0	14	40.0	15	37.5
NO RESP	8	3.1	15	9.5	0	0	2	5.7	1	2.5
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0
INSUR COVRG BY EMPLOYER, DENTAL										
NONE	22	8.6	76	48.1	0	0	18	51.4	21	52.5
PARTIAL	59	23.1	39	24.7	2	100.0	3	8.6	4	10.0
FULL	166	65.1	28	17.7	0	0	12	34.3	14	35.0
NO RESP	8	3.1	15	9.5	0	0	2	5.7	1	2.5
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0
INSUR COVRG BY EMPLOYER, GROUP LIFE										
NONE	154	60.4	97	61.4	2	100.0	22	62.9	37	92.5
PARTIAL	32	12.5	22	13.9	0	0	3	8.6	0	0
FULL	61	23.9	24	15.2	0	0	8	22.9	2	5.0
NO RESP	8	3.1	15	9.5	0	0	2	5.7	1	2.5
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0
INSUR COVRG BY EMPLOYER, LIABILITY										
NONE	196	76.9	116	73.4	2	100.0	25	71.4	34	85.0
PARTIAL	23	9.0	13	8.2	0	0	4	11.4	1	2.5
FULL	28	11.0	14	8.9	0	0	4	11.4	4	10.0
NO RESP	8	3.1	15	9.5	0	0	2	5.7	1	2.5
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE V.39A: FRINGE BENEFITS: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
INSUR COVRG BY EMPLOYER, GENERAL MEDICAL										
NONE	19	9.0	8	12.3	29	18.4	2	20.0	18	17.3
PARTIAL	49	23.2	26	40.0	44	27.8	0	0	27	26.0
FULL	140	66.4	27	41.5	78	49.4	8	80.0	55	52.9
NO RESP	3	1.4	4	6.2	7	4.4	0	0	4	3.8
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0
INSUR COVRG BY EMPLOYER, DENTAL										
NONE	12	5.7	29	44.6	49	31.0	1	10.0	45	43.3
PARTIAL	39	18.5	21	32.3	40	25.3	5	50.0	19	18.3
FULL	157	74.4	11	16.9	62	39.2	4	40.0	36	34.6
NO RESP	3	1.4	4	6.2	7	4.4	0	0	4	3.8
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0
INSUR COVRG BY EMPLOYER, GROUP LIFE										
NONE	129	61.1	39	60.0	80	50.6	3	30.0	72	69.2
PARTIAL	28	13.3	12	18.5	18	11.4	2	20.0	14	13.5
FULL	51	24.2	10	15.4	53	33.5	5	50.0	14	13.5
NO RESP	3	1.4	4	6.2	7	4.4	0	0	4	3.8
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0
INSUR COVRG BY EMPLOYER, LIABILITY										
NONE	147	69.7	45	69.2	95	60.1	6	60.0	66	63.5
PARTIAL	24	11.4	9	13.8	18	11.4	2	20.0	12	11.5
FULL	37	17.5	7	10.8	38	24.1	2	20.0	21	20.2
NO RESP	3	1.4	4	6.2	7	4.4	0	0	5	4.8
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

TABLE V.39B: FRINGE BENEFITS: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
INSUR COVRG BY EMPLOYER, GENERAL MEDICAL								
NONE	4	4.0	8	14.5	2	10.5	4	22.2
PARTIAL	17	17.2	4	7.3	2	10.5	2	11.1
FULL	78	78.8	42	76.4	13	68.4	10	55.6
NO RESP	0	0	1	1.8	2	10.5	2	11.1
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0
INSUR COVRG BY EMPLOYER, DENTAL								
NONE	4	4.0	34	61.8	5	26.3	6	33.3
PARTIAL	10	10.1	3	5.5	3	15.8	0	0
FULL	85	85.9	17	30.9	9	47.4	10	55.6
NO RESP	0	0	1	1.8	2	10.5	2	11.1
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0
INSUR COVRG BY EMPLOYER, GROUP LIFE								
NONE	51	51.5	42	76.4	9	47.4	10	55.6
PARTIAL	8	8.1	2	3.6	2	10.5	2	11.1
FULL	40	40.4	10	18.2	6	31.6	4	22.2
NO RESP	0	0	1	1.8	2	10.5	2	11.1
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0
INSUR COVRG BY EMPLOYER, LIABILITY								
NONE	72	72.7	47	85.5	12	63.2	11	61.1
PARTIAL	9	9.1	0	0	2	10.5	0	0
FULL	18	18.2	7	12.7	3	15.8	5	27.8
NO RESP	0	0	1	1.8	2	10.5	2	11.1
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0

TABLE V.39B: FRINGE BENEFITS: PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
INSUR COVRG BY EMPLOYER, GENERAL MEDICAL										
NONE	5	7.9	0	0	1	14.3	0	0	0	0
PARTIAL	9	14.3	1	16.7	0	0	0	0	2	20.0
FULL	49	77.8	5	83.3	5	71.4	1	100.0	7	70.0
NO RESP	0	0	0	0	1	14.3	0	0	1	10.0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0
INSUR COVRG BY EMPLOYER, DENTAL										
NONE	7	11.1	1	16.7	4	57.1	1	100.0	4	40.0
PARTIAL	9	14.3	2	33.3	0	0	0	0	1	10.0
FULL	47	74.6	3	50.0	2	28.6	0	0	4	40.0
NO RESP	0	0	0	0	1	14.3	0	0	1	10.0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0
INSUR COVRG BY EMPLOYER, GROUP LIFE										
NONE	29	46.0	2	33.3	6	85.7	1	100.0	4	40.0
PARTIAL	11	17.5	2	33.3	0	0	0	0	1	10.0
FULL	23	36.5	2	33.3	0	0	0	0	4	40.0
NO RESP	0	0	0	0	1	14.3	0	0	1	10.0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0
INSUR COVRG BY EMPLOYER, LIABILITY										
NONE	39	61.9	3	50.0	6	85.7	1	100.0	3	30.0
PARTIAL	5	7.9	2	33.3	0	0	0	0	1	10.0
FULL	19	30.2	1	16.7	0	0	0	0	5	50.0
NO RESP	0	0	0	0	1	14.3	0	0	1	10.0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0

3. Salary and Job Perquisites

Teachers and principals in the private sector were asked what types of job perquisites they received in addition to their salaries (see Tables V.40A-B). Possible job perquisites were: housing expenses, utilities, phone, maintenance/ housekeeping, meals, auto, tuition for children, college tuition for self, convention expenses, moving expenses, travel expenses, and other expenses. School personnel indicated whether the school or religious community paid 'none', 'some', or 'all' of their expenses in these job perquisite categories.

Some interesting, but not very surprising patterns emerge from the data set. Secondary principals received the most perquisites, followed by secondary teachers and elementary principals who had fairly comparable levels of job perks, and lastly, elementary teachers. In general, higher percentages of Catholic parochial school personnel received job perquisites than any other private school type, particularly housing-related expenses. The most common types of job perquisites received by teachers and principals at both elementary and secondary level were convention expenses, travel expenses, college tuition for self, free tuition for children (except for Catholic schools), and meals.

Because the tables detailing the job perquisites are so extensive, teachers and principals at elementary and secondary levels will be discussed individually. It should be noted that non-response rates for this question were relatively high. To simplify table descriptions, respondents who received some or all of the perquisites are grouped together.

a. Elementary Teachers.

Very few elementary school teachers reported receiving housing, utility, phone, auto, meals or housekeeping perquisites. About 15% of Catholic parochial teachers received some or all of these perquisites; less than 9% of teachers in the other private school categories reported receiving such perquisites. Between 31% and 58% of private elementary teachers received convention expenses; between 17% and 37% received tuition for themselves. Fourteen to 23% of Catholic parochial, other religious and nonsectarian teachers had their travel expenses covered by their schools. Twenty-six percent of other religious, 33% of nonsectarian, but only 8% of Catholic parochial teachers received free tuition for their children. This result could be a result of fewer Catholic teachers having children.

TABLE V.40A: JOB PERQUISITES RECEIVED BY PRIVATE TEACHERS
IN ADDITION TO SALARY
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
HOUSING EXP CVRED BY SCHOOL								
NONE	88	55.7	2	100.0	26	74.3	27	67.5
SOME	9	5.7	0	0	3	8.6	0	0
ALL	15	9.5	0	0	0	0	0	0
NO RESP	46	29.1	0	0	6	17.1	13	32.5
TOTAL	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0
UTILITY EXP CVRED BY SCHOOL								
NONE	90	57.0	2	100.0	29	82.9	28	70.0
SOME	6	3.8	0	0	1	2.9	0	0
ALL	16	10.1	0	0	0	0	0	0
NO RESP	46	29.1	0	0	5	14.3	12	30.0
TOTAL	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0
PHONE EXP CVRED BY SCHOOL								
NONE	90	57.0	2	100.0	29	82.9	28	70.0
SOME	8	5.1	0	0	2	5.7	0	0
ALL	14	8.9	0	0	0	0	0	0
NO RESP	46	29.1	0	0	4	11.4	12	30.0
TOTAL	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0
MAINT/HSKEEPING EXP COVERED BY SCHOOL								
NONE	89	56.3	2	100.0	29	82.9	28	70.0
SOME	9	5.7	0	0	0	0	0	0
ALL	14	8.9	0	0	0	0	0	0

(CONTINUED)

TABLE V.40A: JOB PERQUISITES RECEIVED BY PRIVATE TEACHERS IN ADDITION TO SALARY
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
MAINT/HSKEEPING EXP COVERED BY SCHOOL								
NO RESP	46	29.1	0	0	6	17.1	12	30.0
TOTAL	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0
MEALS CVRED BY SCHOOL								
NONE	88	55.7	1	50.0	26	74.3	25	62.5
SOME	7	4.4	1	50.0	3	8.6	3	7.5
ALL	18	11.4	0	0	0	0	0	0
NO RESP	45	28.5	0	0	6	17.1	12	30.0
TOTAL	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0
AUTO COVERED BY SCHOOL								
NONE	88	55.7	2	100.0	28	80.0	26	65.0
SOME	8	5.1	0	0	2	5.7	1	2.5
ALL	14	8.9	0	0	0	0	0	0
NO RESP	48	30.4	0	0	5	14.3	13	32.5
TOTAL	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0
FREE TUITION FOR RESPONDENTS CHILDREN								
NONE	85	53.8	1	50.0	21	60.0	15	37.5
SOME	7	4.4	1	50.0	7	20.0	5	12.5
ALL	5	3.2	0	0	2	5.7	8	20.0
NO RESP	61	38.6	0	0	5	14.3	12	30.0
TOTAL	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

(CONTINUED)

TABLE V.40A: JOB PERQUISITES RECEIVED BY PRIVATE TEACHERS IN ADDITION TO SALARY
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
COLLEGE TUITION COVERED BY SCHOOL								
NONE	87	55.1	2	100.0	18	51.4	18	45.0
SOME	8	5.1	0	0	10	28.6	13	32.5
ALL	18	11.4	0	0	3	8.6	0	0
NO RESP	45	28.5	0	0	4	11.4	9	22.5
TOTAL	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0
CONVENTION EXPENSES CVRED BY SCHOOL								
NONE	63	39.9	0	0	10	28.6	9	22.5
SOME	33	20.9	2	100.0	12	34.3	20	50.0
ALL	15	9.5	0	0	8	22.9	3	7.5
NO RESP	47	29.7	0	0	5	14.3	8	20.0
TOTAL	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0
MOVING EXP COVERED BY SCHOOL								
NONE	92	58.2	2	100.0	23	65.7	27	67.5
SOME	0	0	0	0	4	11.4	1	2.5
ALL	13	8.2	0	0	5	14.3	0	0
NO RESP	53	33.5	0	0	3	8.6	12	30.0
TOTAL	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0
TRAVEL EXP COVERED BY SCHOOL								
NONE	88	55.7	2	100.0	22	62.9	20	50.0
SOME	6	3.8	0	0	7	20.0	8	20.0
ALL	16	10.1	0	0	1	2.9	0	0
NO RESP	48	30.4	0	0	5	14.3	12	30.0
TOTAL	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

b. Secondary teachers

Greater percentages of secondary teachers received housing-related expenses than did elementary teachers. Close to 20% of Catholic parochial teachers received housing, utilities, phone, housekeeping, meals, and auto perquisites. About 18% of Catholic private teachers received these housing-related perquisites; between 5% and 13% of other religious and non-sectarian teachers received the same, except for phone expenses which they did not receive and meal expenses, which 42% of non-sectarian and 0% of other religious teachers received.

Almost a majority of secondary teachers (45%-80%) received convention expenses; between 17% and 32% received travel expenses. Higher percentages (30%-80%) of other religious and nonsectarian teachers received college tuition for themselves and free tuition for their children than did their Catholic school peers (11%-22%). Moving expenses were received by between 10% and 19% of secondary teachers.

TABLE V.40A: JOB PERQUISITES RECEIVED BY PRIVATE TEACHERS
IN ADDITION TO SALARY
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
HOUSING EXP CVRED BY SCHOOL								
NONE	31	47.7	82	51.9	5	50.0	65	62.5
SOME	1	1.5	1	0.6	1	10.0	8	7.7
ALL	12	18.5	25	15.8	0	0	4	3.8
NO RESP	21	32.3	50	31.6	4	40.0	27	26.0
TOTAL	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0
UTILITY EXP CVRED BY SCHOOL								
NONE	31	47.7	88	55.7	6	60.0	71	68.3
SOME	0	0	2	1.3	1	10.0	3	2.9
ALL	12	18.5	24	15.2	0	0	10	9.6
NO RESP	22	33.8	44	27.8	3	30.0	20	19.2
TOTAL	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0
PHONE EXP CVRED BY SCHOOL								
NONE	31	47.7	87	55.1	7	70.0	80	76.9
SOME	6	9.2	7	4.4	0	0	1	1.0
ALL	6	9.2	21	13.3	0	0	1	1.0
NO RESP	22	33.8	43	27.2	3	30.0	22	21.2
TOTAL	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0
MAINT/HSKEEPING EXP COVERED BY SCHOOL								
NONE	31	47.7	87	55.1	6	60.0	78	75.0
SOME	5	7.7	6	3.8	1	10.0	5	4.8
ALL	7	10.8	22	13.9	0	0	0	0

(CONTINUED)

TABLE V.40A: JOB PERQUISITES RECEIVED BY PRIVATE TEACHERS IN ADDITION TO SALARY

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
MAINT/HSKEEPING EXP COVERED BY SCHOOL								
NO RESP	22	33.8	43	27.2	3	30.0	21	20.2
TOTAL	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0
MEALS CVRED BY SCHOOL								
NONE	30	46.2	61	38.6	7	70.0	48	46.2
SOME	2	3.1	36	22.8	0	0	41	39.4
ALL	12	18.5	23	14.6	0	0	3	2.9
NO RESP	21	32.3	38	24.1	3	30.0	12	11.5
TOTAL	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0
AUTO COVERED BY SCHOOL								
NONE	30	46.2	86	54.4	6	60.0	79	76.0
SOME	8	12.3	5	3.2	1	10.0	7	6.7
ALL	5	7.7	21	13.3	0	0	0	0
NO RESP	22	33.8	46	29.1	3	30.0	18	17.3
TOTAL	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0
FREE TUITION FOR RESPONDENTS CHILDREN								
NONE	27	41.5	69	43.7	0	0	49	47.1
SOME	6	9.2	9	5.7	7	70.0	14	13.5
ALL	4	6.2	23	14.6	1	10.0	20	19.2
NO RESP	28	43.1	57	36.1	2	20.0	21	20.2
TOTAL	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

(CONTINUED)

c. Elementary Principals

Patterns of job perquisites for principals are similar to those for secondary school teachers, with slight increases and decreases in percentages of principals receiving certain job perquisites. Between 35% and 62% of Catholic parochial elementary principals received housing-related perquisites; between 6% and 28% of nonsectarian and about 20%-30% of other religious principals received housing, utilities and auto expenses. Fewer other religious and nonsectarian principals received meals -- 5% and 11% respectively -- than did teachers in these same categories. Greater percentages of principals received convention expenses (61%-73%) and travel expenses (37%-56%). Percentages of principals receiving college tuition for self (6%-26%) and free tuition for their children (2%-23%) dropped, except for Catholic parochial principals receiving college tuition for self.

TABLE V.40B: JOB PERQUISITES RECEIVED BY PRIVATE PRINCIPALS
IN ADDITION TO SALARY
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
HOUSING EXP CVRED BY SCHOOL						
NONE	15	27.3	10	52.6	14	77.8
SOME	8	14.5	3	15.8	0	0
ALL	25	45.5	3	15.8	1	5.6
NO RESP	7	12.7	3	15.8	3	16.7
TOTAL	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0
UTILITY EXP CVRED BY SCHOOL						
NONE	17	30.9	11	57.9	13	72.2
SOME	1	1.8	2	10.5	1	5.6
ALL	30	54.5	3	15.8	1	5.6
NO RESP	7	12.7	3	15.8	3	16.7
TOTAL	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0
PHONE EXP CVRED BY SCHOOL						
NONE	16	29.1	11	57.9	13	72.2
SOME	18	32.7	0	0	2	11.1
NO RESP	21	38.2	8	42.1	3	16.7
TOTAL	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0
MAINT/HSKEEPING EXP COVERED BY SCHOOL						
NONE	20	36.4	11	57.9	13	72.2
SOME	12	21.8	1	5.3	1	5.6
ALL	16	29.1	0	0	1	5.6
NO RESP	7	12.7	7	36.8	3	16.7

(CONTINUED)

TABLE V.40B: JOB PERQUISITES RECEIVED BY PRIVATE PRINCIPALS
IN ADDITION TO SALARY
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0
MEALS CVRED BY SCHOOL						
NONE	25	45.5	12	63.2	13	72.2
SOME	4	7.3	1	5.3	2	11.1
ALL	17	30.9	0	0	0	0
NO RESP	9	16.4	6	31.6	3	16.7
TOTAL	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0
AUTO COVERED BY SCHOOL						
NONE	16	29.1	8	42.1	10	55.6
SOME	9	16.4	3	15.8	3	16.7
ALL	22	40.0	1	5.3	2	11.1
NO RESP	8	14.5	7	36.8	3	16.7
TOTAL	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0
FREE TUITION FOR RESPONDENTS CHILDREN						
NONE	28	50.9	9	47.4	11	61.1
SOME	1	1.8	3	15.8	3	16.7
ALL	0	0	1	5.3	1	5.6
NO RESP	26	47.3	6	31.6	3	16.7
TOTAL	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0
COLLEGE TUITION COVERED BY SCHOOL						
NONE	25	45.5	7	36.8	12	66.7

(CONTINUED)

TABLE V.40B; JOB PERQUISITES RECEIVED BY PRIVATE PRINCIPALS
IN ADDITION TO SALARY
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
COLLEGE TUITION COVERED BY SCHOOL						
SOME	3	5.5	4	21.1	1	5.6
ALL	11	20.0	1	5.3	0	0
NO RESP	16	29.1	7	36.8	5	27.8
TOTAL	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0
CONVENTION EXPENSES CVRED BY SCHOOL						
NONE	7	12.7	3	15.8	5	27.8
SOME	26	47.3	7	36.8	4	22.2
ALL	14	25.5	6	31.6	7	38.9
NO RESP	8	14.5	3	15.8	2	11.1
TOTAL	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0
MOVING EXP COVERED BY SCHOOL						
NONE	24	43.6	7	36.8	14	77.8
SOME	3	5.5	0	0	0	0
ALL	11	20.0	5	26.3	0	0
NO RESP	17	30.9	7	36.8	4	22.2
TOTAL	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0
TRAVEL EXP COVERED BY SCHOOL						
NONE	20	36.4	7	36.8	5	27.8
SOME	13	23.6	5	26.3	9	50.0
ALL	9	16.4	2	10.5	1	5.6
NO RESP	13	23.6	5	26.3	3	16.7
TOTAL	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0

d. Secondary Principals

Percentages of secondary principals receiving perquisites increased significantly for almost every type of job perk. Between 57% and 100% of Catholic parochial and private principals received some or all of their housing, utilities, housekeeping, meals, and auto expenses. Forty percent of nonsectarian principals received housing, utilities, housekeeping, and meals perks; 60% received auto expenses; 0% received phone coverage. Between 67% and 100% of all secondary principals received convention and travel expenses. The 17%-50% of secondary principals receiving moving expenses was an increase over percentages of teachers and elementary principals receiving this perquisite. Sixty percent of nonsectarian principals received free tuition for their children; less than 14% of Catholic principals received this perk. Thirty-three percent of Catholic parochial, 29% of Catholic private, and 40% of non-sectarian secondary principals reported college tuition for self as a job perquisite.

TABLE V.40B: JOB PERQUISITES RECEIVED BY PRIVATE PRINCIPALS IN ADDITION TO SALARY
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
HOUSING EXP CVRED BY SCHOOL								
NONE	1	16.7	0	0	1	100.0	5	50.0
SOME	0	0	2	28.6	0	0	1	10.0
ALL	5	83.3	3	42.9	0	0	3	30.0
NO RESP	0	0	2	28.6	0	0	1	10.0
TOTAL	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0
UTILITY EXP CVRED BY SCHOOL								
NONE	1	16.7	0	0	1	100.0	5	50.0
SOME	0	0	2	28.6	0	0	1	10.0
ALL	5	83.3	3	42.9	0	0	3	30.0
NO RESP	0	0	2	28.6	0	0	1	10.0
TOTAL	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0
PHONE EXP CVRED BY SCHOOL								
NONE	1	16.7	0	0	1	100.0	6	60.0
SOME	2	33.3	2	28.6	0	0	0	0
NO RESP	3	50.0	5	71.4	0	0	4	40.0
TOTAL	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0
MAINT/HSKEEPING EXP COVERED BY SCHOOL								
NONE	1	16.7	1	14.3	1	100.0	5	50.0
SOME	1	16.7	2	28.6	0	0	3	30.0
ALL	4	66.7	2	28.6	0	0	1	10.0
NO RESP	0	0	2	28.6	0	0	1	10.0

(CONTINUED)

TABLE V.40B: JOB PERQUISITES RECEIVED BY PRIVATE PRINCIPALS IN ADDITION TO SALARY
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0
MEALS CVRED BY SCHOOL								
NONE	0	0	2	28.6	1	100.0	4	40.0
SOME	1	16.7	2	28.6	0	0	3	30.0
ALL	5	83.3	2	28.6	0	0	1	10.0
NO RESP	0	0	1	14.3	0	0	2	20.0
TOTAL	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0
AUTO COVERED BY SCHOOL								
NONE	1	16.7	0	0	1	100.0	1	10.0
SOME	2	33.3	3	42.9	0	0	2	20.0
ALL	3	50.0	2	28.6	0	0	4	40.0
NO RESP	0	0	2	28.6	0	0	3	30.0
TOTAL	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0
FREE TUITION FOR RESPONDENTS CHILDREN								
NONE	3	50.0	0	0	0	0	3	30.0
SOME	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10.0
ALL	0	0	1	14.3	1	100.0	5	50.0
NO RESP	3	50.0	6	85.7	0	0	1	10.0
TOTAL	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0
COLLEGE TUITION COVERED BY SCHOOL								
NONE	2	33.3	0	0	0	0	4	40.0

(CONTINUED)

TABLE V.40B: JOB PERQUISITES RECEIVED BY PRIVATE PRINCIPALS
IN ADDITION TO SALARY
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
COLLEGE TUITION COVERED BY SCHOOL								
SOME	0	0	0	0	1	100.0	3	30.0
ALL	2	33.3	2	28.6	0	0	1	10.0
NO RESP	2	33.3	5	71.4	0	0	2	20.0
TOTAL	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0
CONVENTION EXPENSES CVRED BY SCHOOL								
NONE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SOME	4	66.7	3	42.9	1	100.0	3	30.0
ALL	1	16.7	2	28.6	0	0	7	70.0
NO RESP	1	16.7	2	28.6	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0
MOVING EXP COVERED BY SCHOOL								
NONE	2	33.3	1	14.3	1	100.0	3	30.0
SOME	1	16.7	0	0	0	0	1	10.0
ALL	0	0	2	28.6	0	0	4	40.0
NO RESP	3	50.0	4	57.1	0	0	2	20.0
TOTAL	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0
TRAVEL EXP COVERED BY SCHOOL								
NONE	1	16.7	0	0	0	0	1	10.0
SOME	3	50.0	4	57.1	1	100.0	3	30.0
ALL	1	16.7	1	14.3	0	0	5	50.0
NO RESP	1	16.7	2	28.6	0	0	1	10.0
TOTAL	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0

4. Contribution to Family Income

Teachers and principals were asked if their salaries contributed to over 50% of their families' total gross incomes before taxes (see Tables V.41A-B). The majority of secondary teachers (54%-90%) and elementary public school teachers (72%) reported that they contributed to over 50% of their families' incomes. In contrast, only 33%-43% of private elementary school teachers contributed over 50% of their families' incomes.

Higher percentages of principals (78%-100%), excluding those from the Catholic parochial and private sectors, reported that they contributed over 50% of their family's incomes. Curiously, only 33% of Catholic parochial elementary, 17% of Catholic parochial secondary, and 14% of Catholic private secondary principals indicated they contributed over 50% of their family's incomes. These results may be due to the small number of respondents, or because of the large representation of members of religious orders among Catholic school personnel.

TABLE V.41A: INCOME ACCOUNTS FOR 50% OR MORE OF FAMILY INCOME: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SALARY IS >50% OF FAMILY INCOME										
NO	66	25.9	83	52.5	1	50.0	20	57.1	26	65.0
YES	183	71.8	52	32.9	1	50.0	15	42.9	13	32.5
NO RESPONSE	6	2.4	23	14.6	0	0	0	0	1	2.5
TOTAL	255	100.0	158	100.0	2	100.0	35	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE V.41A: INCOME ACCOUNTS FOR 50% OR MORE OF FAMILY INCOME: TEACHERS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SALARY IS >50% OF FAMILY INCOME										
NO	30	14.2	9	13.8	54	34.2	1	10.0	31	29.8
YES	179	84.8	47	72.3	86	54.4	9	90.0	72	69.2
NO RESPONSE	2	0.9	9	13.8	18	11.4	0	0	1	1.0
TOTAL	211	100.0	65	100.0	158	100.0	10	100.0	104	100.0

TABLE V.41B: INCOME ACCOUNTS FOR 50% OR MORE OF FAMILY INCOME:
PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE							
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SALARY IS >50% OF FAMILY INCOME								
NO	7	7.1	17	30.9	4	21.1	4	22.2
YES	91	91.9	18	32.7	15	78.9	14	77.8
NO RESPONSE	1	1.0	20	36.4	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	99	100.0	55	100.0	19	100.0	18	100.0

TABLE V.41B: INCOME ACCOUNTS FOR 50% OR MORE OF FAMILY INCOME:
PRINCIPALS
GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

	CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE									
	PUBLIC		CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN		CATHOLIC PRIVATE		OTHER RELIGIOUS		NON-SECTARIAN	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SALARY IS >50% OF FAMILY INCOME										
NO	3	4.8	1	16.7	2	28.6	0	0	2	20.0
YES	59	93.7	1	16.7	1	14.3	1	100.0	8	80.0
NO RESPONSE	1	1.6	4	66.7	4	57.1	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	63	100.0	6	100.0	7	100.0	1	100.0	10	100.0

APPENDIX A

SCHOOL, PERSONNEL AND DISTRICT QUESTIONNAIRES AND COVER LETTERS

IFG

Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
STANFORD UNIVERSITY

Dear Educator:

Attached to this letter is a SURVEY form directed toward individual school personnel including teachers or school principals or heads. This survey is part of a major study of schools in the San Francisco Bay Area that is being conducted by the Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance (IFG) at Stanford University. The purpose of this particular portion of the study is to gather detailed information on individual school personnel in order to increase our understanding of the patterns of employment and compensation of school personnel in different types of schooling organizations. The attached questionnaire is being distributed to school personnel in a sample of schools in the Bay Area.

The success of this study depends critically upon your cooperation in this endeavor, and we urge you to participate by completing and returning the attached survey form to IFG. We recognize the sensitivity of the information being requested and are committed to maintaining strict anonymity of responses. NO INDIVIDUAL IDENTIFICATION IS REQUESTED, and your school identification is being requested only for the purpose of identifying the need for follow-up and for matching the information on your questionnaire to information from other sources about your school or the area in which your school is located.

After you have completed the questionnaire, simply refold it so that the Business Reply Permit and IFG address are visible and drop it into the mail. NO POSTAGE IS NECESSARY.

If you have any questions about this survey or the study, please call my office at (415) 497-3440. Summary statistics derived from this survey of school personnel will be made available upon request to Dr. Jay G. Chambers. This information will be available sometime after August 1982.

Sincerely,

Jay G. Chambers

Dr. Jay G. Chambers
Associate Director and
Senior Research Economist

If you are dissatisfied with any procedural aspect of this study you may anonymously report grievances to the Sponsored Projects Office of Stanford University (415) 497-3638.

THIS QUESTIONNAIRE HAS BEEN APPROVED BY THE STANFORD UNIVERSITY HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW PANEL.

CERAS Building, STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305 (415) 497-0957

SURVEY OF PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS

San Francisco Bay Area

INSTRUCTIONS: This questionnaire should take approximately twenty minutes to complete. Please answer as many of the questions as you possibly can. In many of the questions below, you are asked to place a CHECK on the line corresponding to the appropriate answer (numerical codes have been placed in the boxes to facilitate keypunching). In other questions where blank boxes are provided, you are asked to fill in the appropriate information (e.g., a year, number of pupils, dollars, or hours). In questions 2, 3, and 13 you are asked to fill in specific code numbers which are listed on the enclosed CODE SHEET. Your response to any particular question is, of course, strictly voluntary. Return of this questionnaire implies that you have consented to participate in this study.

SECTION I. EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION

1. What is your HIGHEST COLLEGE DEGREE? [✓]

No college Degree......................	___	1	(6)
Associate Degree......................	___	2	
Bachelor's Degree......................	___	3	
Master's Degree......................	___	4	
Specialist or 6-year certificate......	___	5	
Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)...........	___	6	
Other Doctorate (Ph.D., etc.).........	___	7	

2. Print the name of the COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY at which you received your Bachelor's and highest degrees. Fill in the corresponding college code from SECTION A of the enclosed CODE SHEET.

BACHELOR'S DEGREE — COLLEGE/UNIV CODE ☐☐☐☐ (7-10)

(Name of College/University) ______ (from SECTION A of CODE SHEET)

(Location: City, State) ______

HIGHEST DEGREE — COLLEGE/UNIV CODE ☐☐☐☐ (11-14)

(Name of College/University) ______ (from SECTION A of CODE SHEET)

(Location: City, State) ______

3. Print your MAJOR FIELD(S) OF STUDY for your Bachelor's and highest degrees. Fill in the corresponding major code(s) from SECTION B of the CODE SHEET.

MJR CODE

Bachelor's Degree: ______ Undergraduate Major ☐☐ (15-16)

Highest Degree: ______ Graduate Major ☐☐ (17-18) (from SECTION B of CODE SHEET)

4. In what YEAR was your Bachelor's degree awarded?.............................19 ☐☐ (19-20)

5. In what YEAR was your highest degree awarded?......................... 19 ☐☐ (21-22)

6. In what YEAR did you last complete a college class related to your employment as an educator?..................... 19 ☐☐ (23-24)

7. What was your undergraduate GRADE POINT AVERAGE? (4.0=A, 3.0=B, etc.)........................... ☐ . ☐☐ G.P.A. (25-26)

8. Did you spend one or more years of full-time study toward your Bachelor's degree at a COMMUNITY (2 year) COLLEGE?......................... YES ___ 1 NO ___ 2 (27)

9. How many SEMESTER HOURS of college credit have you earned beyond your Bachelor's degree (multiply quarter hours by 2/3)..... GRAD SEM HOURS ☐☐☐ (28-30)

10. Do you now have PERMANENT California CERTIFICATION for the position you currently hold?............ YES ___ 1 NO ___ 2 (31)

11. Are you certified to teach in any other state?.................... YES ___ 1 NO ___ 2 (32)

SECTION II. EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION

12. What PERCENT OF FULL-TIME are you now employed? (e.g., Full-time = 100%, Half-time = 50%)..................... % of F/T ☐☐ (33-35)

13. Please refer to SECTION C of the CODE SHEET. Select the one JOB ASSIGNMENT from this list that best describes your primary job responsibilities. If necessary, you may select up to two secondary assignments. List in the table below each JOB ASSIGNMENT, along with the corresponding 4-digit CODE, and the PERCENT OF FULL-TIME spent, on average, in each.

	JOB ASSIGNMENT CODE FROM SECTION C OF CODE SHEET	PERCENT (%) OF FULL-TIME	
______ (Primary Assign.)	☐☐☐☐	☐☐☐	(36-42)
______ (Secondary Assign.)	☐☐☐☐	☐☐☐	(43-49)
______ (Secondary Assign.)	☐☐☐☐	☐☐☐	(50-56)

14. How many YEARS have you been EMPLOYED by your present school district (count the current school year as one and exclude leaves and sabbaticals)........................ YEARS ☐☐ (57-58)

15. Do you have tenure?................. YES ___ 1 NO ___ 2 Not offered at my school ___ 3 (59)

16. How has your professional career been divided between different kinds of jobs? Divide the total number of YEARS OF WORK EXPERIENCE among the general job categories listed below. Count part-time employment as a fraction of a year. Assign each YEAR OF EXPERIENCE to one (and only one) job category, i.e., DO NOT DOUBLE COUNT. THE TOTAL OF THE COLUMNS BELOW SHOULD EQUAL YOUR TOTAL YEARS OF WORK EXPERIENCE.

	TOTAL YRS. EXPER.	
PRIVATE SCHOOL EMPLOYMENT:		
Teacher..........................	☐☐	(60-61)
Administrator..................	☐☐	(62-63)
Other Professional............	☐☐	(64-65)
PUBLIC SCHOOL EMPLOYMENT:		
Teacher..........................	☐☐	(66-67)
Administrator..................	☐☐	(68-69)
Other Professional............	☐☐	(70-71)
NON-EDUCATION EMPLOYMENT:		
Professional, Technical, Managerial..................	☐☐	(72-73)
Other..............................	☐☐	(74-75)

17. How long do you plan to remain in education: Check only ONE box.

[✓]

Until eligible for early retirement.... ___ 1 (76)
Until normal retirement age............ ___ 2
Definitely plan to leave education when possible.......................... ___ 3
Undecided.................................... ___ 4

18. Since beginning your career as an educator, how many years have you been unemployed (voluntarily or involuntarily) or on leave other than for continuing your education?......................

UNEMPLOYED YRS OF BREAKS ☐☐ (77-78)

19. Is your JOB MOBILITY limited because of your spouse (e.g., his/her job, educational plans, preferences for locale, etc)?..........

YES ___ 1 (79)
NO ___ 2

20. If you could go back to your college days and start over again, would you become an educator? Check ONE.

[✓]

Certainly would........................... ___ 1 (80)
Probably would............................ ___ 2
Chances even for/against.............. ___ 3
Probably would not....................... ___ 4
Certainly would not...................... ___ 5

21. Individuals have various reasons and priorities in choosing their work. Review the list below and enter a '1' in the boxes corresponding to the TWO MOST IMPORTANT FACTORS that led you to choose your current position.

	Enter a "1"	
Salary and fringe benefits..................	☐	(81)
Employment conditions (hours, location).....	☐	(82)
Types of students to be served..............	☐	(83)
General commitment to working with children	☐	(84)
Commitment to furthering religious values...	☐	(85)
Commitment to serve my religious organization	☐	(86)
Lack of attractive job alternatives.........	☐	(87)
Other (specify):............................	☐	(88)

22. Do you feel a strong sense of commitment and loyalty to your school?..........

YES ___ 1 (89)
NO ___ 2

23. If given a choice for next year, which of the following would you choose? Working in:

Your current position.................. ___ 1 (90)
A similar position in a different public school within the same district...... ___ 2
A similar position in a different public school district...................... ___ 3
A similar position in a private school ___ 4
A different occupation................. ___ 5

24. Does (Do) your school(s) offer an ACCELERATED or ADVANCED CURRICULUM for exceptionally bright or gifted pupils?..............

YES ___ 1 (91)
NO ___ 2

25. Which of the following general descriptions of school-wide DISCIPLINARY PROBLEMS would you consider most representative of your school? Check ONE.

[✓]

No SERIOUS Problems......................... ___ 1 (92)
General Disregard for School Rules.......... ___ 2
Poor Attendance............................. ___ 3
Drug and Alcohol Abuse...................... ___ 4
Theft and/or Vandalism...................... ___ 5
Fighting Among Students..................... ___ 6
Violent Acts Committed Against Faculty..... ___ 7

SECTION III. COMPENSATION AND TERMS OF EMPLOYMENT

26. What is your GROSS (before taxes) ANNUAL SALARY from your school district? (Include extra compensation received during the school year for coaching, etc., but exclude any compensation for summer school.)....... $☐☐,☐☐☐ (93-97)

27. Estimate what your GROSS (before taxes) ANNUAL SALARY would be if you were employed in a similar position in a private school.............. $☐☐,☐☐☐ (98-102)

28. Indicate which of the following fringe benefits you receive in addition to your annual salary.

	AMOUNT OF PREMIUM PAID BY EMPLOYER			
	NONE	PARTIAL	FULL	
INSURANCE				
General medical...	___ 1	___ 2	___ 3	(103)
Dental............	___ 1	___ 2	___ 3	(104)
Group Life........	___ 1	___ 2	___ 3	(105)
Liability.........	___ 1	___ 2	___ 3	(106)

29. How many days per year are you required to work under your employment contract? (Include paid holidays.).........

DAYS/YEAR ☐☐☐ (107-109)

30. How many hours per week do you spend in:

	HOURS		MINUTES	
Teaching..........................	☐☐	:	☐☐	(110-113)
Supervising students (incl. study hall, lunch, etc., but exclude teaching.)............	☐☐	:	☐☐	(114-117)
Class preparation................	☐☐	:	☐☐	(118-121)
Extra curricular activities for which you receive compensation	☐☐	:	☐☐	(122-125)

31. What percent of your total TEACHING TIME each week is spent teaching grades or subjects DIFFERENT from those for which you have been CERTIFIED or TRAINED ("trained" means that you consider yourself adequately prepared whether or not you are formally certified in a grade or subject):

PERCENT (%)

(a) Certified.......................... ☐☐☐ (6-8)

(b) Trained............................ ☐☐☐ (9-11)

32. Estimate how many hours of TEACHER AIDE TIME are made available to you each week (include both class and after class time.)

HOURS : MINUTES

Paid aide time.................. ☐☐ : ☐☐ (12-15)

Volunteer aide time............. ☐☐ : ☐☐ (16-19)

33. Which of the following statements best describes the availability of instructional supplies, materials, or equipment in your school(s)?

I can get what I need.......................... ___ 1 (20)
I have difficulty getting what I need.......... ___ 2
I cannot get what I need....................... ___ 3

34. What is your (AVERAGE) CLASS SIZE?.. PUPILS ☐☐ (21-22)

35. How many PUPILS do you teach on an average day? (Exclude study halls and homeroom periods.)............. PUPILS/DAY ☐☐☐ (23-25)

36. Estimate how many of the pupils you teach are (a student may be counted more than once):

NUMBER OF PUPILS

Mentally Gifted.......................... ☐☐☐ (26-28)

Handicapped.............................. ☐☐☐ (29-31)

Limited/Non-English Speaking............. ☐☐☐ (32-34)

Educationally Disadvantaged.............. ☐☐☐ (35-37)

37. Estimate how many of the pupils you teach are (do not count any pupil more than once):

NUMBER OF PUPILS

American Indian or Alaskan Native....... ☐☐☐ (38-40)

Asian or Pacific Islander............... ☐☐☐ (41-43)

Black—Not of Hispanic Origin............ ☐☐☐ (44-46)

Filipino................................ ☐☐☐ (47-49)

Hispanic................................ ☐☐☐ (50-52)

White—Not of Hispanic Origin............ ☐☐☐ (53-55)

38. Which organization (if any) listed below represents the teachers in your school in collective bargaining?

California Teachers Association................ ___ 1 (56)
American Federation of Teachers................ ___ 2
Other (specify)________________________________ ___ 3
Teachers are not formally represented in my school...................................... ___ 4

SECTION IV. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

39. What is your...

(a) AGE?.. ☐☐ (57-58)

(b) SEX?.............................. Male ___ 1 (59)
Female ___ 2

(c) YOUR RACE/ETHNIC Origin?
American Indian or Alaskan Native......... ___ 1 (60)
Asian or Pacific Islander................. ___ 2
Black—Not of Hispanic Origin.............. ___ 3
Filipino.................................. ___ 4
Hispanic.................................. ___ 5
White (non-Hispanic)...................... ___ 6

(d) MARITAL STATUS?
Single.................................... ___ 1 (61)
Married................................... ___ 2
Divorced, Separated, Widowed.............. ___ 3

40. Does your income as an educator account for 50% or more of your family's TOTAL GROSS INCOME (before taxes)?............... YES ___ 1 (62)
NO ___ 2

41. What is your FAMILY SIZE (count yourself plus family members who would presently be counted as dependents on yours or your spouse's tax return)?.................. ☐☐ (63)

42. Do you have any HEALTH problem or condition that limits in any way the amount or kind of work you can do?........ YES ___ 1 (64)
NO ___ 2

43. Has your HEALTH ever prevented you from working for six months or more in a row?.................................. YES ___ 1 (65)
NO ___ 2

44 . What are your parents' occupations (or last occupations if retired, unemployed, or deceased)? Check the one most appropriate category for each.

	FATHER		MOTHER	(66-67)
Professional, Technical Manager or Administrator......	___	1	___	1
Farm Manager or Owner............	___	2	___	2
Sales or Clerical Worker.........	___	3	___	3
Craftsman or Operative...........	___	4	___	4
Service Worker (e.g., food, health personnel or protective service)...........	___	5	___	5
Laborer..........................	___	6	___	6
Private Household or Farm Worker..................	___	7	___	7
Houseperson......................	___	8	___	8

45 . What is the educational attainment in years of schooling of your: (e.g., high school diploma=12 years, bachelor's degree=16 years).

	YRS SCH		
FATHER			(68-69)
MOTHER			(70-71)

46 . If you have taken the Graduate Record Examination (G.R.E.), please indicate your scores to the best of your recollection in the blocks below.

		VERBAL (72)		QUANT. (73)
700 or above..............	___	1	___	1
600-699...................	___	2	___	2
500-599...................	___	3	___	3
400-499...................	___	4	___	4
300-399...................	___	5	___	5
Below 299.................	___	6	___	6

47. Indicate the name of the COUNTY, DISTRICT, and SCHOOL(s) in which you are employed.

COUNTY: ______________________________

DISTRICT: ______________________________

SCHOOL(s): ______________________________

____

(Please leave the boxes at the right blank.) ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ (74-87)

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION. SIMPLY FOLD AND SEAL THE SURVEY FORM (WITH TRANSPARENT TAPE) SO THAT THE RETURN ADDRESS PRINTED BELOW IS VISIBLE AND DROP IT INTO THE MAIL. NO POSTAGE IS NECESSARY.

(1-5)

NO POSTAGE
NECESSARY
IF MAILED
IN THE
UNITED STATES

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL
First Class Permit No. 196, Palo Alto, CA

Postage will be paid by

DR. JAY G. CHAMBERS
Institute for Research on Educational
Finance and Governance
CERAS Bldg. Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

SURVEY OF PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

San Francisco Bay Area

INSTRUCTIONS: This questionnaire should take approximately twenty minutes to complete. Please answer as many of the questions as you possibly can. In many of the questions below, you are asked to place a CHECK on the line corresponding to the appropriate answer (numerical codes have been placed in the boxes to facilitate keypunching). In other questions where blank boxes are provided, you are asked to fill in the appropriate information (e.g., a year, number of pupils, dollars, or hours). In questions 2, 3, and 13 you are asked to fill in specific code numbers which are listed on the enclosed CODE SHEET. Your response to any particular question is, of course, strictly voluntary. Return of this questionnaire implies that you have consented to participate in this study.

SECTION I. EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION

1. What is your HIGHEST COLLEGE DEGREE? [✓]

No college Degree......................	___	1	(6)
Associate Degree......................	___	2	
Bachelor's Degree......................	___	3	
Master's Degree........................	___	4	
Specialist or 6-year certificate......	___	5	
Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)...........	___	6	
Other Doctorate (Ph.D., etc.).........	___	7	

2. Print the name of the COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY at which you received your Bachelor's and highest degrees. Fill in the corresponding college code from SECTION A of the enclosed CODE SHEET.

BACHELOR'S DECREE — COLLEGE/UNIV CODE ☐☐☐☐ (7-10)

___________________________ (Name of College/University) (from SECTION A of CODE SHEET)

___________________________ (Location: City, State)

HIGHEST DEGREE — COLLEGE/UNIV CODE ☐☐☐☐ (11-14)

___________________________ (Name of College/University) (from SECTION A of CODE SHEET)

___________________________ (Location: City, State)

3. Print your MAJOR FIELD(S) OF STUDY for your Bachelor's and highest degrees. Fill in the corresponding major code(s) from SECTION B of the CODE SHEET.

MJR CODE

Bachelor's Degree: ___________________________ Undergraduate Major ☐☐ (15-16)

Highest Degree: ___________________________ Graduate Major ☐☐ (17-18) (from SECTION B of CODE SHEET)

4. In what YEAR was your Bachelor's degree awarded?............................19 ☐☐ (19-20)

5. In what YEAR was your highest degree awarded?.......................... 19 ☐☐ (21-22)

6. In what YEAR did you last complete a college class related to your employment as an educator?...................... 19 ☐☐ (23-24)

7. What was your undergraduate GRADE POINT AVERAGE? (4.0=A, 3.0=B, etc.)........................... G.P.A. ☐.☐ (25-26)

8. Did you spend one or more years of full-time study toward your Bachelor's degree at a COMMUNITY (2 year) COLLEGE?.......................
YES ___ 1 (27)
NO ___ 2

9. How many SEMESTER HOURS of college credit have you earned beyond your Bachelor's degree (multiply quarter hours by 2/3)..... GRAD SEM HOURS ☐☐☐ (28-30)

10. Do you now have PERMANENT California CERTIFICATION for the position you currently hold?............
YES ___ 1 (31)
NO ___ 2

11. Are you certified to teach in any other state?......................
YES ___ 1 (3
NO ___ 2

SECTION II. EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION

12. What PERCENT OF FULL-TIME are you now employed? (e.g., Full-time = 100%, Half-time = 50%)................. % of F/T ☐☐☐ (35-

13. Please refer to SECTION C of the CODE SHEET. Select the one JOB ASSIGNMENT from this list that best describes your primary job responsibilities. If necessary, you may select up to two secondary assignments. List in the table below each JOB ASSIGNMENT, along with the corresponding 4-digit CODE, and the PERCENT OF FULL-TIME spent, on average, in each.

	JOB ASSIGNMENT CODE FROM SECTION C OF CODE SHEET	PERCENT (%) OF FULL-TIME	
___________ (Primary Assign.)	☐☐☐☐	☐☐☐	(36-42)
___________ (Secondary Assign.)	☐☐☐☐	☐☐☐	(43-49)
___________ (Secondary Assign.)	☐☐☐☐	☐☐☐	(50-56)

14. How many YEARS have you been EMPLOYED by your present school district (count the current school year as one and exclude leaves and sabbaticals)......................... YEARS ☐☐ (57-58)

15. Do you have tenure...

	YES	NO	NOT APPLIC	
as a principal?......	___ 1	___ 2	___ 3	(59)
as a teacher?........	___ 1	___ 2	___ 3	(60)

16. How has your professional career been divided between different kinds of jobs? Divide the total number of YEARS OF WORK EXPERIENCE among the general job categories listed below. Count part-time employment as a fraction of a year. Assign each YEAR OF EXPERIENCE to one (and only one) job category, i.e., DO NOT DOUBLE COUNT. THE TOTAL OF THE COLUMNS BELOW SHOULD EQUAL YOUR TOTAL YEARS OF WORK EXPERIENCE.

	TOTAL YRS. EXPER.	
PRIVATE SCHOOL EMPLOYMENT:		
Teacher........................	☐☐	(61-62)
Administrator..................	☐☐	(63-64)
Other Professional.............	☐☐	(65-66)
PUBLIC SCHOOL EMPLOYMENT:		
Teacher........................	☐☐	(67-68)
Administrator..................	☐☐	(69-70)
Other Professional.............	☐☐	(71-72)
NON-EDUCATION EMPLOYMENT:		
Professional, Technical, Managerial..................	☐☐	(73-74)
Other..........................	☐☐	(75-76)

17. How long do you plan to remain in education: Check only ONE box.

[✓]
Until eligible for early retirement.... ___ 1 (77)
Until normal retirement age............ ___ 2
Definitely plan to leave education when possible.......................... ___ 3
Undecided.............................. ___ 4

18. Since beginning your career as an educator, how many years have you been unemployed (voluntarily or involuntarily) or on leave other than for continuing your education?.......................... UNEMPLOYED YRS OF BREAKS ☐☐ (78-79)

19. Is your JOB MOBILITY limited because of your spouse (e.g., his/her job, educational plans, preferences for locale, etc)? ....
YES ___ 1 (80)
NO ___ 2

20. If you could go back to your college days and start over again, would you become an educator? Check ONE.

[✓]
Certainly would......................... ___ 1 (81)
Probably would.......................... ___ 2
Chances even for/against................ ___ 3
Probably would not...................... ___ 4
Certainly would not..................... ___ 5

21. Individuals have various reasons and priorities in choosing their work. Review the list below and enter a '1' in the boxes corresponding to the TWO MOST IMPORTANT FACTORS that led you to choose your current position.

	Enter a "1"	
Salary and fringe benefits....................	☐	(82)
Employment conditions (hours, location).....	☐	(83)
Types of students to be served..............	☐	(84)
General commitment to working with children	☐	(85)
Commitment to furthering religious values...	☐	(86)
Commitment to serve my religious organization	☐	(87)
Lack of attractive job alternatives.........	☐	(88)
Other (specify):	☐	(89)

22. Do you feel a strong sense of commitment and loyalty to your school?..........
YES ___ 1 (90)
NO ___ 2

23. If given a choice for next year, which of the following would you choose? Working in:

Your current position.................... ___ 1 (91)
A similar position in a different public school within the same district....... ___ 2
A similar position in a different public school district....................... ___ 3
A similar position in a private school ___ 4
A different occupation................... ___ 5

24. Does (Do) your school(s) offer an ACCELERATED or ADVANCED CURRICULUM for exceptionally bright or gifted pupils?..............
YES ___ 1 (92)
NO ___ 2

25. Which of the following general descriptions of school-wide DISCIPLINARY PROBLEMS would you consider most representative of your school? Check ONE.

[✓]
No SERIOUS Problems.......................... ___ 1 (93)
General Disregard for School Rules.......... ___ 2
Poor Attendance.............................. ___ 3
Drug and Alcohol Abuse....................... ___ 4
Theft and/or Vandalism....................... ___ 5
Fighting Among Students...................... ___ 6
Violent Acts Committed Against Faculty..... ___ 7

SECTION III. COMPENSATION AND TERMS OF EMPLOYMENT

26. What is your GROSS (before taxes) ANNUAL SALARY from your school district? (Include extra compensation received during the school year for coaching, etc., but exclude any compensation for summer school.)..... $☐☐,☐☐☐ (94-98)

27. Estimate what your GROSS (before taxes) ANNUAL SALARY would be if you were employed in a similar position in a private school.............. $☐☐,☐☐☐ (99-103)

28. Indicate which of the following fringe benefits you receive in addition to your annual salary.

	AMOUNT OF PREMIUM PAID BY EMPLOYER			
	NONE	PARTIAL	FULL	
INSURANCE				
General medical...	___ 1	___ 2	___ 3	(104)
Dental............	___ 1	___ 2	___ 3	(105)
Group Life........	___ 1	___ 2	___ 3	(106)
Liability.........	___ 1	___ 2	___ 3	(107)

29. How many days per year are you required to work under your employment contract? (Include paid holidays.)..... DAYS/YEAR ☐☐☐ (108-110)

30. How many hours per week do you spend in:

	HOURS		MINUTES	
Administrative activities.......	☐☐	:	☐☐	(111-114)
Teaching (exclude study hall)...	☐☐	:	☐☐	(115-118)
Supervising students (incl. study hall, lunch, etc., but exclude teaching.)............	☐☐	:	☐☐	(119-122)

SECTION IV. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

31. What is your...

(a) AGE?.................................... ☐☐ (123-124)

(b) SEX?.............................

Male	___	1	(125)
Female	___	2	

(c) YOUR RACE/ETHNIC Origin?

American Indian or Alaskan Native.........	___	1	(6)
Asian or Pacific Islander.................	___	2	
Black—Not of Hispanic Origin............	___	3	
Filipino..................................	___	4	
Hispanic..................................	___	5	

(d) MARITAL STATUS?

Single....................................	___	1	(7)
Married...................................	___	2	
Divorced, Separated, Widowed..............	___	3	

32. Does your income as an educator account for 50% or more of your family's TOTAL GROSS INCOME (before taxes)?.............

YES	___	1	(8)
NO	___	2	

33. What is your FAMILY SIZE (including only members residing in your household)?.. ☐☐ (9-10)

34. Do you have any HEALTH problem or condition that limits in any way the amount or kind of work you can do?......

YES	___	1	(11)
NO	___	2	

35. Has your HEALTH ever prevented you from working for six months or more in a row?..............................

YES	___	1	(12)
NO	___	2	

36. What are your parents' occupations (or last occupations if retired, unemployed, or deceased)? Check the one most appropriate category for each.

	FATHER (13)		MOTHER (14)	
Professional, Technical Manager or Administrator......	___	1	___	1
Farm Manager or Owner............	___	2	___	2
Sales or Clerical Worker.........	___	3	___	3
Craftsman or Operative...........	___	4	___	4
Service Worker (e.g., food, health personnel or protective service)...........	___	5	___	5
Laborer..........................	___	6	___	6
Private Household or Farm Worker....................	___	7	___	7
Houseperson......................	___	8	___	8

37. What is the educational attainment in years of schooling of your: (e.g., high school diploma=12 years, bachelor's degree=16 years).

	YRS SCH	
FATHER	☐☐	(15-16)
MOTHER	☐☐	(17-18)

38. If you have taken the Graduate Record Examination (G.R.E.), please indicate your scores to the best of your recollection in the blocks below.

	VERBAL (19)		QUANT. (2	
700 or above............	___	1	___	1
600-699.................	___	2	___	2
500-599.................	___	3	___	3
400-499.................	___	4	___	4
300-399.................	___	5	___	5
Below 299...............	___	6	___	6

---

39. Indicate the name of the COUNTY, DISTRICT, and SCHOOL(s) in which you are employed.

COUNTY: ______________________________

DISTRICT: ______________________________

SCHOOL(s): ______________________________

____

(Please leave the boxes at the right blank.) ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ (21-34)

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION. SIMPLY FOLD AND SEAL THE SURVEY FORM (WITH TRANSPARENT TAPE) SO THAT THE RETURN ADDRESS PRINTED BELOW IS VISIBLE AND DROP IT INTO THE MAIL. NO POSTAGE IS NECESSARY.

№ 41281 (1-5)

NO POSTAGE
NECESSARY
IF MAILED
IN THE
UNITED STATES

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL
First Class Permit No. 196, Palo Alto, CA

Postage will be paid by

DR. JAY G. CHAMBERS
Institute for Research on Educational
Finance and Governance
CERAS Bldg. Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

SURVEY OF PRIVATE SCHOOL HEADS AND PRINCIPALS
San Francisco Bay Area

INSTRUCTIONS: Please answer as many of the questions as you possibly can. In many of the questions below, you are asked to place a CHECK on the line corresponding to the appropriate answer (numerical codes have been placed in the boxes to facilitate keypunching). In other questions where blank boxes are provided, you are asked to fill in the appropriate information (e.g., a year, number of pupils, dollars, or hours). In questions 2, 3, and 13 you are asked to fill in specific code numbers which are listed on the enclosed CODE SHEET. Your response to any particular question is, of course, strictly voluntary. Return of this questionnaire implies that you have consented to participate in this study. This questionnaire should not take more than 20 minutes to complete.

SECTION I. EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION

1. What is your HIGHEST COLLEGE DEGREE? [✓]

No college Degree........................ ___ 1 (6)
Associate Degree......................... ___ 2
Bachelor's Degree........................ ___ 3
Master's Degree.......................... ___ 4
Educational Specialist Degree (based on 6 yrs. of college).......... ___ 5
Doctor of Education (Ed.D.).............. ___ 6
Other Doctorate (Ph.D., etc.)............ ___ 7

2. Print the name of the COLLEGE(s) OR UNIVERSITY(s) at which you received your Bachelor's and highest degrees. If you have not completed a Bachelor's Degree, please give the name of the college or university at which you have earned the largest amount of college credits. Please fill in the corresponding college code from SECTION A of the enclosed CODE SHEET.

BACHELOR'S DEGREE/or MOST CREDIT EARNED

COLLEGE/UNIV CODE ☐☐☐☐ (7-10) (from SECTION A of CODE SHEET)

(Name of College/Univ.)

(Location: City, State)

HIGHEST DEGREE

COLLEGE/UNIV CODE ☐☐☐☐ (11-14) (from SECTION A of CODE SHEET)

(Name of College/Univ.)

(Location: City, State)

3. Print your MAJOR FIELD(S) OF STUDY for your Bachelor's and highest degrees. Fill in the corresponding major code(s) from SECTION B of the CODE SHEET.

MJR CODE

Bachelor's Degree: ________ Undergraduate Major ☐☐ (15-16)

Highest Degree: ________ Graduate Major ☐☐ (17-18) (from SECTION B of CODE SHEET)

4. In what YEAR was your BACHELOR'S DEGREE awarded?............................ 19 ☐☐ (19-20)

5. In what YEAR was your HIGHEST DEGREE awarded?............................. 19 ☐☐ (21-22)

6. In what YEAR did you last complete a college class related to your employment as an educator?....................... 19 ☐☐ (23-24)

7. What was your undergraduate GRADE POINT AVERAGE? (4.0=A, 3.0=B, etc.)................................ GPA ☐.☐ (25-26)

8. Did you spend one or more years of full-time study toward your Bachelor's degree at a COMMUNITY (2 year) COLLEGE?..........................

YES ___ 1 (27)
NO ___ 2

9. How many SEMESTER HOURS of college credit have you earned beyond your Bachelor's degree? (multiply quarter hours by 2/3)....... GRAD SEM HOURS ☐☐☐ (28-30)

10. Do you have a California teaching credential?...............................

YES ___ 1 (31)
NO ___ 2

11. Do you have a teaching credential or certificate from any other state?...............................

YES ___ 1 (32)
NO ___ 2

SECTION II. EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION

12. What PERCENT OF FULL-TIME are you now employed? (e.g., Full-time = 100%, Half-time = 50%)................ % of FULL-TIME ☐☐☐ (33-35)

13. Please refer to SECTION C of the CODE SHEET. Select the one JOB ASSIGNMENT from this list that best describes your primary job responsibilities. If necessary, you may select up to two secondary assignments. List in the table below each JOB ASSIGNMENT, along with the corresponding 4-digit CODE, and the PERCENT OF FULL-TIME spent, on average, in each.

	JOB ASSIGNMENT CODE FROM SECTION C OF CODE SHEET	PERCENT (%) OF FULL-TIME	
(Primary Assign.)	☐☐☐☐	☐☐☐	(36-42)
(Secondary Assign.)	☐☐☐☐	☐☐☐	(43-49)
(Secondary Assign.)	☐☐☐☐	☐☐☐	(50-56)

14. How many YEARS have you been EMPLOYED by your present school? (Count the current school year as one and exclude leaves and sabbaticals).................................. YEARS ☐☐ (57-58)

15. How has your total employment experience been divided between different kinds of jobs? Divide the total number of YEARS OF WORK EXPERIENCE among the general job categories listed below. Count part-time employment as a fraction of a year. Assign each YEAR OF EXPERIENCE to one (and only one) job category, i.e., DO NOT DOUBLE COUNT. THE TOTAL OF THE COLUMNS BELOW SHOULD EQUAL YOUR TOTAL YEARS OF WORK EXPERIENCE.

	TOTAL YRS. EXPERIENCE	
PRIVATE SCHOOL EMPLOYMENT:		
Teacher................................	☐☐	(59-60)
Administrator..........................	☐☐	(61-62)
Other Professional.....................	☐☐	(63-64)
PUBLIC SCHOOL EMPLOYMENT:		
Teacher................................	☐☐	(65-66)
Administrator..........................	☐☐	(67-68)
Other Professional.....................	☐☐	(69-70)
NON-EDUCATION EMPLOYMENT:		
Professional, Technical, Managerial	☐☐	(71-72)
Other..................................	☐☐	(73-74)

16. How long do you plan to remain in education? Check only ONE box. [✓]

Until eligible for early retirement... ___ 1 (75)
Until normal retirement age............ ___ 2
Definitely plan to leave education when possible.......................... ___ 3
None of the above...................... ___ 4

17. Since beginning your career as an educator, how many years have you been unemployed (voluntarily or involuntarily) or on leave other than for continuing your education?.............. UNEMPLOYED YRS OF BREAKS ☐☐ (76-77)

18. Is your JOB MOBILITY limited because of your spouse (e.g., his/her job, educational plans, preferences for locale, etc.)?........

YES ___ 1 (78)
NO ___ 2

19. If you could go back to your college days and start over again, would you become an educator? Check ONE.

Certainly would........................... ___ 1 (79)
Probably would............................ ___ 2
Chances even for/against.................. ___ 3
Probably would not........................ ___ 4
Certainly would not....................... ___ 5

20. Individuals have various reasons and priorities in choosing their work. Review the list below and enter a '1' in the boxes corresponding to the TWO MOST IMPORTANT FACTORS that led you to choose your current position.

Enter a '1'

Salary and fringe benefits.................... ___ (80)
Employment conditions (hours, location)..... ___ (81)
Types of students to be served............... ___ (82)
General commitment to working with children ___ (83)
Commitment to furthering religious values... ___ (84)
Commitment to serve my religious organization ___ (85)
Lack of attractive job alternatives......... ___ (86)
Other (specify): ______________________ ___ (87)

21. Do you feel a strong sense of commitment and loyalty to your school?...........

YES ___ 1 (88)
NO ___ 2

22. If given a choice for next year, which of the following would you choose? Working in: Check ONE:

Your current position........................ ___ 1 (89)
A similar position in a different private school.............................. ___ 2
A similar position in a public school...... ___ 3
A different occupation....................... ___ 4

23. Does (Do) your school(s) offer an ACCELERATED or ADVANCED CURRICULUM for exceptionally bright or gifted PUPILS?

YES ___ 1 (90)
NO ___ 2

24. Which of the following general descriptions of school-wide DISCIPLINARY PROBLEMS would you consider most representative of your school? Check ONE.

No SERIOUS Problems.......................... ___ 1 (91)
General Disregard for School Rules.......... ___ 2
Poor Attendance.............................. ___ 3
Drug and Alcohol Abuse....................... ___ 4
Theft and/or Vandalism....................... ___ 5
Fighting Among Students...................... ___ 6
Violent Acts Committed Against Faculty..... ___ 7

SECTION III. COMPENSATION AND TERMS OF EMPLOYMENT

25. What is your 1981-82 GROSS ANNUAL SALARY (before taxes and contributed services or donations to your school)? (Include extra compensation received during the school year for coaching, etc., but exclude any compensation for summer school.)....................$ ☐☐,☐☐☐ (92-96)

26. If you are a member of a religious order or community:

(a) Does your school pay all or part of your salary to the religious community or order of which you are a member?....

YES ___ 1 (97)
NO ___ 2

(b) Is all or part of your salary returned to your school as a contribution?...........................

YES ___ 1 (98)
NO ___ 2

27. If you answered "YES" to 26a or b, what is the annual cash payment you receive?..............$ ☐☐,☐☐☐ (99-103)

28. Indicate which of the following fringe benefits you receive in addition to your annual salary.

	AMOUNT OF PREMIUM PAID BY EMPLOYER			
	NONE	PARTIAL	FULL	
INSURANCE				
General medical...	___ 1	___ 2	___ 3	(104)
Dental.............	___ 1	___ 2	___ 3	(105)
Group Life.........	___ 1	___ 2	___ 3	(106)
Liability..........	___ 1	___ 2	___ 3	(107)

PENSION:

What percentage of your GROSS ANNUAL SALARY does your employer contribute to private pension funds on your behalf?............................ PERCENT ☐☐☐ (108-110)

Do you contribute to Social Security?..........................

YES ___ 1 (111)
No ___ 2

29. Indicate which of the following JOB PERQUISITES you receive in addition to the salary or cash payments indicated in questions 26 and 28. Check the appropriate column depending on whether your school or religious community pays 'none', 'some' or 'all' of your expenses in each of the categories designated below.

JOB PERQUISITE	PAYMENTS IN KIND: EXPENSES COVERED BY YOUR SCHOOL OR RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY None	 Some	 All	
Housing expenses......	__ 1	__ 2	__ 3	(112)
Utilities.............	__ 1	__ 2	__ 3	(113)
Telephone.............	__ 1	__ 2	__ 3	(114)
Housekeeping/Maintenance............	__ 1	__ 2	__ 3	(115)
Meals.................	__ 1	__ 2	__ 3	(116)
Automobile............	__ 1	__ 2	__ 3	(117)
Tuition for your children............	__ 1	__ 2	__ 3	(118)
College tuition for yourself............	__ 1	__ 2	__ 3	(119)
Convention expenses...	__ 1	__ 2	__ 3	(120)
Moving exp. incurred to accept job.......	__ 1	__ 2	__ 3	(121)
Travel................	__ 1	__ 2	__ 3	(122)
Other (specify):......	__ 1	__ 2	__ 3	(123)

---

30. Estimate what your GROSS ANNUAL SALARY would be if you were employed in a similar position in a public school.................$ ☐☐,☐☐☐ (6-10)

31. How many DAYS PER YEAR of sick leave and/or personal leave are you entitled to? (If unlimited, indicate '99' in boxes.).... DAYS LEAVE PER YEAR ☐☐ (11-12)

32. What is the LENGTH of your EMPLOYMENT CONTRACT? (nearest whole year).............. YEARS ☐☐ (13-14)

33. How many DAYS PER YEAR are you required to work under your employment contract? (Include paid holidays.).... DAYS/YEAR ☐☐☐ (15-17)

34. How many HOURS PER WEEK (on average) do you spend in:

	HOURS	:	MINUTES	
Administrative activities........	☐☐	:	☐☐	(18-21)
Teaching (exclude study hall)....	☐☐	:	☐☐	(22-25)
Supervising students (incl. study hall, lunch, etc., but exclude teaching.).................	☐☐	:	☐☐	(26-29)
School related activities or events for which you receive no extra compensation..........	☐☐	:	☐☐	(30-33)

SECTION IV. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

35. What is your:

(a) AGE?.................................... ☐☐ (34-35)

(b) SEX?..............................Male __ 1 (36)
Female __ 2

(c) YOUR RACE/ETHNIC Origin?

American Indian or Alaskan Native.......	__ 1	(37)
Asian or Pacific Islander...............	__ 2	
Black—Not of Hispanic Origin............	__ 3	
Filipino................................	__ 4	
Hispanic................................	__ 5	
White—Not of Hispanic Origin............	__ 6	

(d) MARITAL STATUS?

Single..................................	__ 1	(38)
Married.................................	__ 2	
Divorced, Separated, Widowed............	__ 3	

36. Does your income as an educator account for 50% or more of your family's TOTAL GROSS (before taxes) INCOME?

YES __ 1
NO __ 2 (39)

37. What is your FAMILY SIZE (count yourself plus family members who would presently be counted as dependents on yours or your spouse's tax return)?......................... ☐ (40-41)

38. Do you have any HEALTH problem or condition that limits in any way the amount or kind of work you can do?

YES __ 1 (42)
NO __ 2

39. Has your HEALTH ever prevented you from working for six months or more in a row?

YES __ 1 (43)
NO __ 2

40. What are your PARENTS' OCCUPATIONS (or last occupations if retired, unemployed, or deceased)? Check the one most appropriate category for each.

	FATHER	MOTHER	
Professional, Technical Manager or Administrator........	__ 1	__ 1	(44-45)
Farm Manager or Owner............	__ 2	__ 2	
Sales or Clerical Worker..........	__ 3	__ 3	
Craftsman or Operative............	__ 4	__ 4	
Service Worker (e.g., food, health, personnel or protective service).......................	__ 5	__ 5	
Laborer..........................	__ 6	__ 6	
Private Household or Farm Worker.....................	__ 7	__ 7	
Houseperson......................	__ 8	__ 8	

41. What is the educational attainment in years of schooling of your: (e.g., high school diploma= 12 years, bachelor's degree= 16 years)............................

	YRS	SCH	
FATHER			(46-47)
MOTHER			(48-49)

42. If you have taken the Graduate Record Examination (G.R.E.), indicate your scores to the best of your recollection.

	VERBAL (50)	QUANT. (51)
700 or above............	___ 1	___ 1
600-699.................	___ 2	___ 2
500-599.................	___ 3	___ 3
400-499.................	___ 4	___ 4
300-399.................	___ 5	___ 5
Below 299..............	___ 6	___ 6

43. Indicate the name of the COUNTY, CITY, and SCHOOL(s) in which you are employed.

COUNTY: ____________________

CITY: ____________________

SCHOOL: ____________________

(Please leave the boxes at the right blank.) ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ (52-65)

(Please leave the boxes blank.)

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION. SIMPLY FOLD AND SEAL THE SURVEY FORM (WITH TRANSPARENT TAPE) SO THAT THE RETURN ADDRESS PRINTED BELOW IS VISIBLE AND DROP IT INTO THE MAIL. NO POSTAGE IS NECESSARY.

№ 51352 (1-5)

NO POSTAGE
NECESSARY
IF MAILED
IN THE
UNITED STATES

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL
First Class Permit No. 196, Palo Alto, CA

Postage will be paid by

DR. JAY G. CHAMBERS
Institute for Research on Educational
Finance and Governance
CERAS Bldg. Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

SURVEY OF PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS
San Francisco Bay Area

INSTRUCTIONS: Please answer as many of the questions as you possibly can. In many of the questions below, you are asked to place a CHECK on the line corresponding to the appropriate answer (numerical codes have been placed in the boxes to facilitate keypunching). In other questions where blank boxes are provided, you are asked to fill in the appropriate information (e.g., a year, number of pupils, dollars, or hours). In questions 2, 4, and 14 you are asked to fill in specific code numbers which are listed on the enclosed CODE SHEET. Your response to any particular question is, of course, strictly voluntary. Return of this questionnaire implies that you have consented to participate in this study. This questionnaire should not take more than 30 minutes to complete.

SECTION I. EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION

1. What is your HIGHEST COLLEGE DEGREE?

	[✓]		
No college Degree........................	☐	1	(7)
Associate Degree.........................	☐	2	
Bachelor's Degree........................	☐	3	
Master's Degree..........................	☐	4	
Specialist or 6 year certificate........	☐	5	
Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)..............	☐	6	
Other Doctorate (Ph.D., etc.)...........	☐	7	

2. Print the name of the COLLEGE(s) OR UNIVERSITY(s) at which you received your Bachelor's and highest degrees. If you have not completed a Bachelor's Degree, please give the name of the college or university at which you have earned the largest amount of college credits. Please fill in the corresponding college code from SECTION A of the enclosed CODE SHEET.

BACHELOR'S DEGREE/or MOST CREDIT EARNED — COLLEGE/UNIV CODE ☐☐☐☐ (8-11)

_______________________ (Name of College/Univ.) (from SECTION A of CODE SHEET)

_______________________ (Location: City, State)

HIGHEST DEGREE — COLLEGE/UNIV CODE ☐☐☐☐ (12-15)

_______________________ (Name of College/Univ.) (from SECTION A of CODE SHEET)

_______________________ (Location: City, State)

3. If you have NOT completed a BACHELOR'S DEGREE, please indicate the total number of SEMESTER HOURS (multiply quarter hours by 2/3) of COLLEGE CREDIT earned. SEMESTER HRS. ☐☐☐ (16-18)

4. Print your MAJOR FIELD(S) OF STUDY for your Bachelor's and highest degrees. Fill in the corresponding major code(s) from SECTION B of the CODE SHEET.

MJR CODE

Bachelor's Degree: _______________________ Undergraduate Major ☐☐ (19-20)

Highest Degree: _______________________ Graduate Major ☐☐ (21-22)

(from SECTION B of CODE SHEET)

5. In what YEAR was your BACHELOR'S DEGREE awarded?............................ 19 ☐☐ (23-24)

6. In what YEAR was your HIGHEST DEGREE awarded?............................ 19 ☐☐ (25-26)

7. In what YEAR did you last complete a college class related to your employment as an educator?........................ 19 ☐☐ (27-28)

8. What was your undergraduate GRADE POINT AVERAGE? (4.0=A, 3.0=B, etc.)................................ GPA ☐.☐ (29-30)

9. Did you spend one or more years of full-time study toward your Bachelor's degree at a COMMUNITY (2 year) COLLEGE?.........................

YES	☐	1	(31)
NO	☐	2	

10. How many SEMESTER HOURS of college credit have you earned beyond your Bachelor's degree? (multiply quarter hours by 2/3)....... GRAD SEM HOURS ☐☐☐ (32-34)

11. Do you have a California teaching credential?...............................

YES	☐	1	(35)
NO	☐	2	

12. Do you have a teaching credential or certificate from any other state?..............................

YES	☐	1	(36)
NO	☐	2	

SECTION II. EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION

13. What PERCENT OF FULL-TIME are you now employed? (e.g., Full-time = 100%, Half-time = 50%)................ % of FULL-TIME ☐☐☐ (37-39)

14. Please refer to SECTION C of the CODE SHEET. Select the one JOB ASSIGNMENT from this list that best describes your primary job responsibilities. If necessary, you may select up to two secondary assignments. List in the table below each JOB ASSIGNMENT, along with the corresponding 4-digit CODE, and the PERCENT OF FULL-TIME spent, on average, in each.

	JOB ASSIGNMENT CODE FROM SECTION C OF CODE SHEET	PERCENT (%) OF FULL-TIME	
_______________ (Primary Assign.)	☐☐☐☐	☐☐☐	(40-46)
_______________ (Secondary Assign.)	☐☐☐☐	☐☐☐	(47-53)
_______________ (Secondary Assign.)	☐☐☐☐	☐☐☐	(54-60)

15. How many YEARS have you been EMPLOYED by your present school? (Count the current school year as one and exclude leaves and sabbaticals).................................. YEARS ☐☐ (61-62)

16. Do you have tenure or a continuing contract in your school?.......
YES ☐ 1 (63)
NO ☐ 2
NOT OFFERED AT MY SCHOOL ☐ 3

17. How has your total employment experience been divided between different kinds of jobs? Please divide the total number of YEARS OF WORK EXPERIENCE among the general job categories listed below. Count part-time employment as a fraction of a year. Assign each YEAR OF EXPERIENCE to one (and only one) job category, i.e., DO NOT DOUBLE COUNT. THE TOTAL OF THE COLUMNS BELOW SHOULD EQUAL YOUR TOTAL YEARS OF WORK EXPERIENCE.

	TOTAL YRS. EXPERIENCE	
PRIVATE SCHOOL EMPLOYMENT:		
Teacher...............................	☐☐	(64-65)
Administrator.........................	☐☐	(66-67)
Other Professional....................	☐☐	(68-69)
PUBLIC SCHOOL EMPLOYMENT:		
Teacher...............................	☐☐	(70-71)
Administrator.........................	☐☐	(72-73)
Other Professional....................	☐☐	(74-75)
NON-EDUCATION EMPLOYMENT:		
Professional, Technical, Managerial..	☐☐	(76-77)
Other.................................	☐☐	(78-79)

18. How long do you plan to remain in education: Check only ONE box. [✓]

Until eligible for early retirement.... ☐ 1 (80)
Until normal retirement age............ ☐ 2
Definitely plan to leave education when possible......................... ☐ 3
None of the above...................... ☐ 4

19. Since beginning your career as an educator, how many years have you been unemployed (voluntarily or involuntarily) or on leave other than for continuing your education?.............. UNEMPLOYED YRS OF BREAKS ☐☐ (81-82)

20. Is your JOB MOBILITY limited because of your spouse (e.g., his/her job, educational plans, preferences for locale, etc.)?.........
YES ☐ 1 (83)
NO ☐ 2

21. If you could go back to your college days and start over again, would you become an educator? Check ONE.

Certainly would.......................... ☐ 1 (84)
Probably would........................... ☐ 2
Chances even for/against................. ☐ 3
Probably would not....................... ☐ 4
Certainly would not...................... ☐ 5

22. Individuals have various reasons and priorities in choosing their work. Review the list below and enter a '1' in the boxes corresponding to the TWO MOST IMPORTANT FACTORS that led you to choose your current position.

Enter a "1"
Salary and fringe benefits.................. ☐ (85)
Employment conditions (hours, location)..... ☐ (86)
Types of students to be served.............. ☐ (87)
General commitment to working with children ☐ (88)
Commitment to furthering religious values... ☐ (89)
Commitment to serve my religious organization ☐ (90)
Lack of attractive job alternatives......... ☐ (91)
Other (specify): ____________________ ☐ (92)

23. Do you feel a strong sense of commitment and loyalty to your school?..........
YES ☐ 1 (93)
NO ☐ 2

24. If given a choice for next year, which of the following would you choose? Working in: Check ONE:

Your current position......................... ☐ 1 (94)
A similar position in a different private school............................ ☐ 2
A similar position in a public school...... ☐ 3
A different occupation..................... ☐ 4

25. Does (Do) your school(s) offer an ACCELERATED or ADVANCED CURRICULUM for exceptionally bright or gifted PUPILS?....
YES ☐ 1 (95)
NO ☐ 2

26. Which of the following general descriptions of school-wide DISCIPLINARY PROBLEMS would you consider most representative of your school? Check ONE.

No SERIOUS Problems......................... ☐ 1 (96)
General Disregard for School Rules.......... ☐ 2
Poor Attendance............................. ☐ 3
Drug and Alcohol Abuse...................... ☐ 4
Theft and/or Vandalism...................... ☐ 5
Fighting Among Students..................... ☐ 6
Violent Acts Committed Against Faculty..... ☐ 7

SECTION III. COMPENSATION AND TERMS OF EMPLOYMENT

27. What is your 1981-82 GROSS ANNUAL SALARY (before taxes and contributed services or donations to your school) from your school? (Include extra compensation received during the school year for coaching, etc., but exclude any compensation for summer school.)...... $ ☐☐ , ☐☐☐ (97-101)

28. If you are a member of a religious order or community:

(a) Does your school pay all or part of your salary directly to the religious community or order of which you are a member?.....
YES ☐ 1 (102)
NO ☐ 2

(b) Is all or part of your salary returned to your school as a contribution?.........................
YES ☐ 1 (103)
NO ☐ 2

29. If you answered "YES" to 28a or b, what is the annual cash payment you receive?............ $ ☐☐ , ☐☐☐ (104-108)

30. Indicate which of the following JOB PERQUISITES you receive in addition to the salary or cash payments indicated in questions 27 or 29. Check the appropriate column depending on whether your school or religious community pays 'none', 'some' or 'all' of your expenses in each of the categories designated below.

	PAYMENTS IN KIND: EXPENSES COVERED BY YOUR SCHOOL OR RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY			
JOB PERQUISITE	None	Some	All	
Housing expenses.......	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(109)
Utilities..............	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(110)
Telephone..............	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(111)
Housekeeping/Maintenance.............	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(112)
Meals..................	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(113)
Automobile.............	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(114)
Tuition for your children.............	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(115)
College tuition for yourself.............	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(116)
Convention expenses....	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(117)
Moving exp. incurred to accept job........	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(118)
Travel.................	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(119)
Other (specify):.......	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(120)

31. Indicate which of the following fringe benefits you receive in addition to your annual salary.

	AMOUNT OF PREMIUM PAID BY EMPLOYER			
	NONE	PARTIAL	FULL	
INSURANCE				
General medical..	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(121)
Dental...........	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(122)
Group Life.......	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(123)
Liability........	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(124)

PENSION:

What percentage of your GROSS ANNUAL SALARY does your employer contribute to private pension funds on your behalf?.......................... PERCENT ☐☐ (6-8)

Do you contribute to Social Security?.......................... YES ☐ 1 / No ☐ 2 (9)

32. How many DAYS PER YEAR of sick leave and/or personal leave are you entitled to per year? (If unlimited, indicate '99' in boxes.)........................ DAYS LEAVE PER YEAR ☐☐ (10-11)

33. How many DAYS PER YEAR are you required to work under your employment contract? (Include paid holidays.)... DAYS/YEAR ☐☐☐ (12-14)

34. Estimate what your GROSS ANNUAL SALARY would be if you were employed in a similar position in a public school................ $ ☐☐ , ☐☐☐ (15-19)

35. How many HOURS PER WEEK (on average) do you spend in:

	HOURS	: MINUTES	
Teaching (actual class time, exclude study hall)............	☐☐	: ☐☐	(20-23)
Supervising students (incl. study hall, lunch, etc., but exclude teaching.)......................	☐☐	: ☐☐	(24-27)
Preparing classroom activities...	☐☐	: ☐☐	(28-31)
Extra curricular activities for which you receive compensation	☐☐	: ☐☐	(32-35)
School related activities or events for which you receive no extra compensation..........	☐☐	: ☐☐	(36-39)
Tutoring individual students (remedial or advanced) outside normal class time.............	☐☐	: ☐☐	(40-43)

36. What percent of your total TEACHING TIME each week is spent teaching grades or subjects DIFFERENT from those for which you have been formally TRAINED?.......... PERCENT (%) ☐☐☐ (44-46)

37. Please estimate how many hours per week of TEACHER AIDE TIME are made available to you (include both class and after class time?)

	HOURS	MINUTES	
Paid aide time.................	☐☐	: ☐☐	(47-50)
Volunteer aide time............	☐☐	: ☐☐	(51-54)

38. Which of the following statements best describes the availability of instructional supplies, materials, or equipment in your school(s)?

I can get what I need...................... ☐ 1 (55)
I have difficulty getting what I need..... ☐ 2
I cannot get what I need................... ☐ 3

39. What is your (AVERAGE) CLASS SIZE?.................................. PUPILS ☐☐ (56-57)

40. How many PUPILS do you teach on an average day? (Exclude study halls and homeroom periods.)........... PUPILS/DAY ☐☐☐ (58-60)

41. Estimate how many of the pupils you teach are (students may be counted in more than one category):

	NUMBER OF PUPILS	
Mentally Gifted	☐☐☐	(61-63)
Handicapped..........................	☐☐☐	(64-66)
Limited/Non-English Speaking.........	☐☐☐	(67-69)
Educationally Disadvantaged..........	☐☐☐	(70-72)

42. Estimate how many of the pupils you teach are (do not count any pupil more than once):

	NUMBER OF PUPILS	
American Indian or Alaskan Native....	☐☐☐	(73-75)
Asian or Pacific Islander............	☐☐☐	(76-78)
Black—Not of Hispanic Origin........	☐☐☐	(79-81)
Filipino.............................	☐☐☐	(82-84)
Hispanic.............................	☐☐☐	(85-87)
White—Not of Hispanic Origin........	☐☐☐	(88-90)

43. Which organization (if any) listed below represents the teachers in your school in collective bargaining?

California Teachers Association........... ☐ 1 (91)
American Federation of Teachers........... ☐ 2
Other (Specify) ______________________ ☐ 3
Teachers are not formally represented in my school.................................... ☐ 4

SECTION IV. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

44. What is your:

(a) AGE?.................................... ☐☐ (92-93)

(b) SEX?............................ [redacted]

(c) YOUR RACE/ETHNIC Origin?
American Indian or Alaskan Native....... ☐ 1 (95)
Asian or Pacific Islander............... ☐ 2
Black—Not of Hispanic Origin........... ☐ 3
Filipino................................ ☐ 4
Hispanic................................ ☐ 5
White—Not of Hispanic Origin........... ☐ 6

(d) MARITAL STATUS?
Single.................................. ☐ 1 (96)
Married................................. ☐ 2
Divorced, Separated, Widowed............ ☐ 3

45. Does your income as an educator account for 50% or more of your family's TOTAL GROSS (before taxes) INCOME? .... YES ☐ 1 NO ☐ 2 (97)

46. What is your FAMILY SIZE (count yourself plus family members who would presently be counted as dependents on yours or your spouse's tax return)? .... ☐☐ (98-99)

47. Do you have any HEALTH problem or condition that limits in any way the amount or kind of work you can do? .... YES ☐ 1 NO ☐ 2 (100)

48. Has your HEALTH ever prevented you from working for six months or more in a row? .... YES ☐ 1 NO ☐ 2 (101)

49. What are your PARENTS' OCCUPATIONS (or last occupations if retired, unemployed, or deceased)? Check the one most appropriate category for each. (102-103)

	FATHER	MOTHER
Professional, Technical Manager or Administrator	☐ 1	☐ 1
Farm Manager or Owner	☐ 2	☐ 2
Sales or Clerical Worker	☐ 3	☐ 3
Craftsman or Operative	☐ 4	☐ 4
Service Worker (e.g., food, health, personnel or protective service)	☐ 5	☐ 5
Laborer	☐ 6	☐ 6
Private Household or Farm Worker	☐ 7	☐ 7
Houseperson	☐ 8	☐ 8

50. What is the educational attainment in years of schooling of your: (e.g., high school diploma= 12 years, bachelor's degree= 16 years) ....

	YRS SCH	
FATHER	☐☐	(104-105)
MOTHER	☐☐	(106-107)

51. If you have taken the Graduate Record Examination (G.R.E.), please indicate your scores to the best of your recollection in the blocks below.

	VERBAL (108)	QUANT. (109)
700 or above	☐ 1	☐ 1
600-699	☐ 2	☐ 2
500-599	☐ 3	☐ 3
400-499	☐ 4	☐ 4
300-399	☐ 5	☐ 5
Below 299	☐ 6	☐ 6

52. Indicate the name of the SCHOOL in which you are employed.

SCHOOL: ______________________________ ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ (110-123)
(Please leave the boxes blank.)

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION. SIMPLY FOLD AND SEAL THE SURVEY FORM (WITH TRANSPARENT TAPE SO THAT THE RETURN ADDRESS PRINTED BELOW IS VISIBLE AND DROP IT INTO THE MAIL. NO POSTAGE IS NECESSARY.

[redacted] (1-5)

NO POSTAGE
NECESSARY
IF MAILED
IN THE
UNITED STATES

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL
First Class Permit No. 196, Palo Alto, CA

Postage will be paid by

DR. JAY G. CHAMBERS
Institute for Research on Educational
Finance and Governance
CERAS Bldg. Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

IFG
Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
STANFORD UNIVERSITY

Dear Educator:

Attached to this letter is a SURVEY form directed toward individual school personnel including teachers or school principals or heads. This survey is part of a major study of schools in the San Francisco Bay Area that is being conducted by the Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance (IFG) at Stanford University. The purpose of this particular portion of the study is to gather detailed information on individual school personnel in order to increase our understanding of the patterns of employment and compensation of school personnel in different types of schooling organizations. The attached questionnaire is being distributed to school personnel in a sample of schools in the Bay Area.

The success of this study depends critically upon your cooperation in this endeavor, and we urge you to participate by completing and returning the attached survey form to IFG. We recognize the sensitivity of the information being requested and are committed to maintaining strict anonymity of responses. NO INDIVIDUAL IDENTIFICATION IS REQUESTED, and your school identification is being requested only for the purpose of identifying the need for follow-up and for matching the information on your questionnaire to information from other sources about your school or the area in which your school is located.

After you have completed the questionnaire, simply refold it so that the Business Reply Permit and IFG address are visible and drop it into the mail. NO POSTAGE IS NECESSARY.

If you have any questions about this survey or the study, please call my office at (415) 497-3440. Summary statistics derived from this survey of school personnel will be made available upon request to Dr. Jay G. Chambers. This information will be available sometime after August 1982.

Sincerely,

Jay G. Chambers

Dr. Jay G. Chambers
Associate Director and
Senior Research Economist

If you are dissatisfied with any procedural aspect of this study you may anonymously report grievances to the Sponsored Projects Office of Stanford University (415) 497-3638.

THIS QUESTIONNAIRE HAS BEEN APPROVED BY THE
STANFORD UNIVERSITY HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW PANEL.

CERAS Building, STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305 (415) 497-0957

IFG

Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
STANFORD UNIVERSITY

Dear Educator:

About two weeks ago, you were sent a questionnaire from IFG. The purpose of the questionnaire was to gather detailed information on teachers and school principals or heads in order to examine the patterns of employment and compensation of school personnel in the San Francisco Bay Area. These questionnaires were sent out to a sample of individual school personnel in the Bay Area.

This letter and the accompanying survey form is a final follow-up to gather information on individuals who have not responded to the initial survey. If you have already completed and returned your questionnaire to us, please disregard this letter and the questionnaire and simply dispose of it. If you have not yet responded, we would like to encourage you to complete the attached questionnaire and return it to us.

Although response is voluntary, the information requested is critical to the success of the study. We recognize the sensitivity of the information you are asked to provide and are committed to maintaining strict anonymity of individual responses. No attempt is made to identify individuals on the questionnaire, and we have requested your school identification only to match the information to other sources of data that will be gathered in connection with this study.

After you have completed the questionnaire, simply refold it so that the Business Reply Permit and IFG address are visible and drop it into the mail. NO POSTAGE IS NECESSARY.

Sincerely,

Jay G Chambers

Dr. Jay G. Chambers
Associate Director and
Senior Research Economist

If you are dissatisfied with any procedural aspect of this study you may anonymously report grievances to the Sponsored Projects Office of Stanford University (415) 497-3638.

THIS QUESTIONNAIRE HAS BEEN APPROVED BY THE
STANFORD UNIVERSITY HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW PANEL.

CERAS Building, STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305 (415) 497-0957

PUBLIC SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS: This questionnaire should take approximately 20-25 minutes to complete. Please answer as many questions as you possibly can. You may, of course, refuse to answer any questions that you find objectionable. Since we are surveying a wide variety of public and private schools, you may also find that a very few questions or response categories are simply inapplicable to your school or its operations; please skip over them and continue. Some questions require only a check mark while others require entering a "1" or "0" when multiple responses are possible. In the remaining questions, boxes are provided for filling in the appropriate number of students, teachers, dollars, and so forth. Please ESTIMATE any of these numerical answers if they are too difficult to compute from your own records. Return of this questionnaire implies that you consent to participate in this study. We recommend that you use a lead pencil to fill in this questionnaire.

SECTION I. SCHOOL IDENTIFICATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. School Name: ______________________

2. City: ______________________

3. County: ______________________

SECTION II. STAFF

4. Complete this table by filling in the TOTAL NUMBER (full-time and part-time) of personnel who are on your school's payroll. The possible types of personnel by function are listed in column (1). Count each staff member under the one and only one category in column (1) that best characterizes that member's primary job function. If any personnel type or category does not apply to your school, simply leave the corresponding boxes blank.

STAFFING PATTERNS, 1981-82

Types of Personnel (1)	PAID STAFF (Personnel on Your School's Payroll) UNDUPLICATED COUNT Total No. Full-Time (2)	Part-Time (3)	
ADMINISTRATORS			
Principal/Head..............			(6-9)
Asst. Administrators(s).....			(10-13)
Other Instructional or Program administrator(s)..			(14-17)
Business or General Administrator or Manager..			(18-21)
Other Administrators: Specify: ____________			(22-25)
____________			(26-29)
SUPPORT STAFF:			
Secretary/Clerical..........			(30-33)
Accounting/Bookkeeping......			(34-37)
Other (e.g., Custodial & Maintenance)...............			(38-41)

5. Estimate the level of CONTRIBUTED OR VOLUNTEER SERVICES received by your school during the most recent year for each of the following categories of services. Use the following scale:

0=None
1=1 to 10 total person-days per year
2=11 to 25 total person-days per year
3=26 to 50 total person-days per year
4=51 to 75 total person-days per year
5=75 or more total person-days per year

Professional services (e.g., physician, lawyer, accountant).........................		(42)
Instructional services (e.g., teachers, aides, media personnel)......................		(43)
Supporting services—athletic events (e.g., ticket takers, coaches).....................		(44)
Supporting services—other extra curricular (e.g, advisors, group leaders)...............		(45)
Transportation services (e.g., bus drivers, mechanics).................................		(46)
Maintenance services (e.g., custodian, gardener)...................................		(47)
Fund-raising services..........................		(48)

6. Indicate the number of TEACHERS on your payroll who fit each of the following categories or descriptions:

a. number of teachers who have been employed in your school for:

	NUMBER OF TEACHERS	
Less than 1 year (newly hired).......		(49-
1 to 5 years..........................		(5
6 to 10 years.........................		(53-
11 to 20 years........................		(55-56)
20 years or more......................		(57-58)

b. number of teachers who have left your school during the last two years for the following reasons:

	1979-80	1980-81	
Budget cuts or declining enrollments................			(59-62)
Leave of absence............			(63-66)
Unsatisfactory performance..			(67-70)
Retirement..................			(71-74)
Death.......................			(75-78)
Other (family reasons, employment opportunities, etc.).			(79-82)

III. EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHIES, PROGRAMS, AND POLICIES

7. Indicate the area(s) that receive particular emphasis at your school:

	(Enter a "1")	
College preparation	☐	(83)
Basic skills orientation	☐	(84)
Critical and original thinking stimulated	☐	(85)
Respect for authority instilled	☐	(86)
Vocational preparation	☐	(87)
Social development (cultural pluralism, etc.)	☐	(88)
Self-esteem development	☐	(89)
Religious, ethical values	☐	(90)
Other (specify) ____________	☐	(91)

8. What feature(s) of your school would you cite as particularly contributing to your success as a school?

	(Enter a "1")	
Highly dedicated teachers	☐	(92)
Superior student discipline	☐	(93)
Superior course offerings	☐	(94)
Good parental involvement	☐	(95)
Good student morale	☐	(96)
Highly selected student body	☐	(97)
Other (specify) ____________	☐	(98)

9. Do any of the following SPECIFIC PRACTICES contribute to your school's success?

	(Enter a "1")	
a. Instructional Programs		
School-wide use of a particular teaching method	☐	(99)
School-wide use of a particular curriculum	☐	(100)
b. Student Evaluation		
School-wide review of each student's progress	☐	(101)
Dismissal of poor students	☐	(102)

10. When you are hiring a new teacher, what attributes are considered to be most important? Please rate on a scale from "1" (least important) to "5" (most important) by entering a check in the appropriate space.

	Least Important 1	2	3	4	Most Important 5	
Masters Degree or higher	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(103)
Bachelors Degree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(104)
Previous teaching experience	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(105)
Membership in a religious order or community	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(106)
Religious or other affiliations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(107)
Personal lifestyle	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(108)
Gender	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(109)
Race/ethnic origin (Affirmative Action)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(110)
Philosophy of education	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(111)
State Teaching Credential	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(112)
Other professional credential (specify) ____________	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(113)
Other (specify) ____________	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(114)

IV. SCHOOL GOVERNANCE AND ENVIRONMENT

11. Does your school have a school site council and/or advisory boards?

YES	___	1	(115)
NO	___	0	

IF YES, please indicate from the selected list below the council and/or boards which are currently active at your school by placing a '1' opposite each:

	(Enter a "1")	
School Site Council	☐	(116)
ESEA Title I Advisory Board	☐	(117)
Bilingual Programs Advisory Board	☐	(118)
Other Advisory Committees (please specify) ____________	☐	(119)

12. Does the principal/head of the school function:

	Check only one:		
Primarily, as the instructional leader of the school	☐	1	(120)
Primarily, as the administrative manager of the school, delegating instructional decisions to teachers	☐	2	
As both instructional leader and administrative manager	☐	3	
As neither of above. Primary function is: ____________	☐	4	

13. For the following decisions, indicate how much influence each of the designated positions or groups is likely to have. Record a number from the Influence Scale for each position and decision.

Influence Scale
NA- Not applicable
1 - None
2 - Little
3 - Moderate
4 - Fairly High
5 - High

Decisions	State Department of Education	School District/ Board	School Advisory Council(s)/ Committee(s)	Principal/ Head	Faculty	P.T.A.	
a. adopting a major change in curriculum	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(6-11)
b. hiring a new teacher	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(12-17)
c. dismissing a teacher	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(18-23)
d. determining student admission policies	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(24-29)
e. defining school budget	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(30-35)

14. What types of information does your school collect on a regular basis? Enter a "1" in the first column opposite each item of information collected by your school. Enter a "1" in the second column if you were required to collect this information by some external public agency.

TYPE OF INFORMATION	INFORMATION COLLECTED (Enter a "1")	COLLECTION REQUIRED (Enter a "1")	
achievement test scores..............	☐	☐	(36-37)
numbers of students admitted to other institutions (e.g., prep schools, colleges)........................	☐	☐	(38-39)
systematic surveys of student attitudes, satisfaction...........	☐	☐	(40-41)
systematic surveys of parental attitudes, satisfaction...........	☐	☐	(42-43)
systematic data on teacher performance in the classroom.........	☐	☐	(44-45)
systematic data on teacher qualifications, credentials...............	☐	☐	(46-47)
information on prizes, scholarships won by students....................	☐	☐	(48-49)
other (specify)________________	☐	☐	(50-51)
______________________________	☐	☐	(52-53)

15. Indicate how information about your school and its program priorities are communicated to interested parties outside the school.

	(Enter a "1")	
Written brochure/program descriptions...........	☐	(54)
Advertising in public media (newspapers, periodicals, etc.)............................	☐	(55)
Public presentations by school administrator(s)............................	☐	(56)
Regular visits to feeder schools or supporting organizations............................	☐	(57)
Use of public relations specialist.............	☐	(58)
Reliance on school reputation, word-of-mouth...	☐	(59)
Private or church related publications.........	☐	(60)

16. Is your school accredited by an outside organization?....................... YES ___ 1 (61) NO ___ 0

If YES, check or specify the accrediting agency(ies).

	(Enter a "1")	
California Association of Independent Schools..	☐	(62)
Western Association of Schools and Colleges..	☐	(63)
Western Catholic Education Association.........	☐	(64)
General Conference of Seventh-Day Adventists..	☐	(65)
Montessori Associations International..........	☐	(66)
Other, specify: ____________________....	☐	(67)

17. Specify the regional or national association(s) that are affiliated with your school. (Omit associations in which individuals within your school might have membership; i.e., professional groups.)

Please list ______________________________ (68)

____

____

V. GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

18. Of the selected programs listed below, please indicate those in which your school and/or its students participate. Enter a "1" in the first column opposite each program in which there is school or student participation. If school or students do not participate, indicate with NA. In the second column, estimate the number of students who participate in this program.

	PROGRAM PARTICIPATION (Enter a "1")	STUDENT PARTICIPATION (ESTIMATED NO.)	
Adult Basic Education (PL 93-380)........................	☐	☐☐☐	(69-72)
CETA Title I (PL 93-303)..........	☐	☐☐☐	(73-76)
CETA Title II, VI (PL 93-303)....	☐	☐☐☐	(77-80)
Children's Centers (Soc. Sec. Act XX).............	☐	☐☐☐	(81-84)
ESEA Title I.......................	☐	☐☐☐	(85-88)
ESEA Title IV-B, Library and Learning Resources.............	☐	XXX	(89)
ESEA Title IV-C, Demo. Programs..	☐	XXX	(90)
ESEA Title VII, Bilingual Education........................	☐	☐☐☐	(91-94)
Federal Impact Aid (PL 81-874)...	☐	XXX	(95)
Handicapped Education (PL 94-142)	☐	☐☐☐	(96-98)
Indochinese Education (PL 94-23 and 94-313)......................	☐	☐☐☐	(99-102)
Miller-Unruh Basic Reading (Ed Code 5770).................	☐	☐☐☐	(103-106)
National School Lunch Program (PL 92-433)......................	☐	☐☐☐	(107-110)
Nutrition Program (State of California SB120)...............	☐	☐☐☐	(111-114)
School-Age Parenting (Ed Code 16790).................	☐	☐☐☐	(115-118)
School Improvement Program (Ed Code 52000-52040)...........	☐	XXX	(119)
State Pre-School Program (Ed Code 16601)................	☐	☐☐☐	(120-123)
State Bilingual Education Program	☐	☐☐☐	(6-9)
Urban Impact Aid.................	☐	XXX	(10)
Vocational Education (PL 50-576)	☐	☐☐☐	(11-14)

19. Are any students currently enrolled in your school also dually enrolled in college classes?................................. YES ___ 1 (15) NO ___ 0

If YES, estimate how many.................. ☐☐ (16-17)

20. Are any students currently enrolled in your school also dually enrolled in private school classes (K-12)?........................... YES ___ 1 (18) NO ___ 0

If YES, estimate how many.................. ________ (19-20)

21. Are any students currently enrolled in private schools in your district also dually enrolled in public school classes? YES ___ 1 (21) NO ___ 0

22. Estimate how much of your time and the time of other administrators in your school is devoted to administering all of these publicly funded programs. Rate the overall amount of time commitment on a scale ranging from "5" if a great deal of time is spent to a "1" if almost no time is spent on managing these programs.

Amount of time commitment...................... ☐ (22)

23. In your opinion, how well integrated or coordinated are the administrative and reporting requirements of the public programs in which your school or your students participate? For each set of programs, rank the level of integration of these requirements on a scale ranging from "5" if very well integrated to "1" if not well integrated. If program involvement by your school and students is not adequate for you to answer this question, indicate with NA.

Coordination of state program requirements....... ☐ (23)
Coordination of federal program requirements..... ☐ (24)
Coordination of state with federal program requirements................................ ☐ (25)

24. Which of the following does your school district do to ease the reporting burden for your school?

a. Does the district send individual administrators to your school to help school site personnel in the reporting process?...... YES ☐ 1 / NO ☐ 0 (26)

b. Does the district conduct its own training workshops or send personnel to other training workshops?.......................... YES ☐ 1 / NO ☐ 0 (27)

c. Does the district collect a bank of information so the school does not have to fill out the same information on different forms?.. YES ☐ 1 / NO ☐ 0 (28)

d. Does the district provide a directory of the administrative personnel who are responsible for the various programs?............. YES ☐ 1 / NO ☐ 0 (29)

25. List those federal, state, or local agencies that have performed ON SITE INSPECTION of publicly funded programs within the last three years:

(30)

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION. SIMPLY FOLD AND SEAL THE SURVEY FORM (WITH TRANSPARENT TAPE) SO THAT THE RETURN ADDRESS PRINTED BELOW IS VISIBLE AND DROP IT INTO THE MAIL. NO POSTAGE IS NECESSARY.

(1-5)

NO POSTAGE
NECESSARY
IF MAILED
IN THE
UNITED STATES

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL
First Class Permit No. 196, Palo Alto, CA

Postage will be paid by

DR. JAY G. CHAMBERS
Institute for Research on Educational
Finance and Governance
CERAS Bldg. Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS: This questionnaire should take approximately 20-25 minutes to complete. Please answer as many questions as you possibly can. You may, of course, refuse to answer any questions that you find objectionable. Since we are surveying a wide variety of schools and school districts, you may also find that a very few questions or response categories are simply inapplicable to your district or its operations; please skip over them and continue. Some questions require only a check mark while others require entering a "1" or some other number when multiple responses are possible. In the remaining questions, boxes are provided for filling in the appropriate number of students, teachers, and so forth. Please ESTIMATE any of these numerical answers if they are too difficult to compute from your own records. Return of this questionnaire implies that you consent to participate in this study. We recommend that you use a lead pencil to fill in this questionnaire.

SECTION I. DISTRICT IDENTIFICATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. District Name:______________________________

2. City:______________________________

3. County:______________________________

SECTION II. STAFF

4. Estimate how many JOB APPLICATIONS or inquiries for teaching positions your school district received for the 1981-82 school year....................... NO. OF APPLIC. ☐☐☐☐ (6-9)

IF NO applications or inquiries were received, indicate the reason.

Check One

Schools have no need for additional staff ☐ 1 (10)
Other (specify) ____________________ ☐ 0

5. When you are hiring a new teacher, what attributes are considered to be most important? Please rate on a scale from "1" (least important) to "5" (most important) by entering a check in the appropriate space.

	Least Important 1	2	3	4	Most Important 5	
Masters Degree or higher...	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(11)
Bachelors Degree...........	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(12)
Previous teaching experience	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(13)
Membership in a religious order or community.......	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(14)
Religious or other affiliations.............	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(15)
Personal lifestyle..........	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(16)
Gender......................	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(17)
Race/ethnic origin (Affirmative Action).....	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(18)
Philosophy of education....	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(19)
State Teaching Credential..	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(20)
Other professional credential (specify) __________	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(21)
Other (specify) __________	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(22)

SECTION III. SCHOOL GOVERNANCE AND ENVIRONMENT

6. Are there any WRITTEN GUIDELINES that specify how a teacher could appeal an administrative decision concerning evaluation, pay, promotion, or discipline?...............................

YES ☐ 1 (23)
NO ☐ 0

IF YES:

Check (✓) One Below

a. Were these written guidelines established within your district or by the state?..............................

DISTRICT ☐ 1 (24)
STATE ☐ 0

b. To the best of your knowledge, in what year were written guidelines for appeals first established?........... 19 ☐☐ (25-26)

c. Are the written guidelines for appeals the result of negotiations with a teachers' organization?..........................

YES ☐ 1 (27)
NO ☐ 0

d. According to the written guidelines, which of the following persons or groups are designated to review teacher appeals? (Enter a '1')

Department chair.............................. ☐ (28)
Principal, headmaster, president............. ☐ (29)
District administration or governing board... ☐ (30)
Specifically designated officer, ombudsman, or committee................................ ☐ (31)
Arbitration or mediation committee/hearing officer.................................... ☐ (32)
Other (please specify) ____________________ ☐ (33)

7. Indicate which of the following statements best describes the nature of any EMPLOYMENT NEGOTIATIONS on wages, hours of employment, and other terms and conditions of employment of teachers for the 1981-82 school year.

Check (✓) One Below

a. Formal negotiations (i.e., negotiations that led to a written agreement) with a teacher's organization................ ☐ 1 (34)
b. Informal negotiations (i.e., negotiations that did not lead to a written agreement) with a teachers organization..... ☐ 2
c. Individual negotiations between the school district and individual employees...... ☐ 3
d. Wages, hours and terms and conditions of employment are essentially determined unilaterally by the school district.... ☐ 4

8. For the following decisions, indicate how much influence each of the designated positions or groups is likely to have. Record a number from the Influence Scale for each position and decision.

Influence Scale
NA- Not applicable
1 - None
2 - Little
3 - Moderate
4 - Fairly High
5 - High

Decisions	State Department of Education	School District/ Board	School Advisory Council(s)/ Committee(s)	Principal/ Head	Faculty	P.T.A.	
a. adopting a major change in curriculum	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(35-40)
b. hiring a new teacher...............	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(41-46)
c. dismissing a teacher............	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(47-52)
d. determining student admission policies...	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(53-58)
e. defining school budget...............	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(59-64)

9. What types of information does your school district collect on a regular basis? Enter a "1" in the first column opposite each item of information collected by your school district. Enter a "1" in the second column if you were required to collect this information by some external agency.

TYPE OF INFORMATION	INFORMATION COLLECTED (Enter a '1')	COLLECTION REQUIRED (Enter a "1")	
achievement test scores.............	☐	☐	(65-66)
numbers of students admitted to other institutions (e.g., prep schools, colleges).........................	☐	☐	(67-68)
systematic surveys of student attitudes, satisfaction...........	☐	☐	(69-70)
systematic surveys of parental attitudes, satisfaction...........	☐	☐	(71-72)
systematic data on teacher performance in the classroom.........	☐	☐	(73-74)
systematic data on teacher qualifications, credentials..............	☐	☐	(75-76)
information on prizes, scholarships won by students....................	☐	☐	(77-78)
other (specify) ______________	☐	☐	(79-80)
______________	☐	☐	(81-82)

10. Indicate how information about your school and its program priorities are communicated to interested parties outside the school.

	(Enter a '1')	
Written brochure/program descriptions..........	☐	(83)
Advertising in public media (newspapers, periodicals, etc.)............................	☐	(84)
Public presentations by school administrator(s)............................	☐	(85)
Regular visits to feeder schools or supporting organizations............................	☐	(86)
Use of public relations specialist.............	☐	(87)
Reliance on school reputation, word-of-mouth...	☐	(88)
Private or church related publications.........	☐	(89)

11. Specify the regional or national association(s) that are affiliated with your district.

	MEMBERSHIP (Enter a "1")	
Assn. of California Urban School Districts.....	☐	(90)
Assn. of Low Wealth School Districts...........	☐	(91)
California Assn. of Compensatory Education.....	☐	(92)
California Assn. for Bilingual Education.......	☐	(93)
California Tax Reform Assn.....................	☐	(94)
Schools for Sound Finance......................	☐	(95)
Small School Districts Assn....................	☐	(96)
Suburban School Districts Assn.................	☐	(97)
California School Boards Assn..................	☐	(98)
Other (specify) ______________	☐	(99)

12. Is your school district a member of a consortium of school districts which jointly participate in programs and report to the state?..

YES ☐ 1 (100)
NO ☐ 0

13. Which of the following does your school district do to coordinate school reporting on state and federal programs?

a. Does the district send individual administrators to schools to help school site personnel in the reporting process?.....
YES ☐ 1 (101)
NO ☐ 0

b. Does the district conduct its own training workshops or send personnel to other training workshops?..................
YES ☐ 1 (102)
NO ☐ 0

c. Does the district collect a bank of information so the school does not have to fill out the same information on different forms?
YES ☐ 1 (103)
NO ☐ 0

d. Does the district provide a directory of the administrative personnel who are responsible for the various questions?.....
YES ☐ 1 (104)
NO ☐ 0

14. Does this school district have one or more district advisory boards..........
YES ☐ 1 (105)
NO ☐ 0

If YES, how many? Estimate number....... ☐☐ (106-107)

SECTION IV. GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS AND PUBLIC SCHOOLS

15. Of the selected programs listed below, please indicate those in which your school district participates. Enter a '1' opposite each program in which there is district participation.

	PROGRAM PARTICIPATION (Enter a '1')	
Adult Basic Education (PL 93-380)................	☐	(108)
CETA Title I (PL 93-203)..........................	☐	(109)
CETA Title II, VI (PL 93-203).....................	☐	(110)
Children's Centers (Soc. Sec. Act XX)............	☐	(111)
ESAA, Emergency School Aid........................	☐	(112)
ESEA Title I......................................	☐	(113)
ESEA Title IV-B, Library and Learning Resources	☐	(114)
ESEA Title IV-C, Demo. Programs.................	☐	(115)
ESEA Title VII, Bilingual Education..............	☐	(116)
State Bilingual Education........................	☐	(117)
Federal Impact Aid (PL 81-874)..................	☐	(118)
Handicapped Education (PL 94-142)...............	☐	(119)
State Special Education..........................	☐	(120)
Indochinese Education (PL 94-23 and 94-313).....	☐	(121)
Miller-Unruh Basic Reading (Ed Code 5770).......	☐	(122)
National School Lunch Program (PL 92-433).......	☐	(123)
Nutrition Program (State of California SB120)...	☐	(124)
School-Age Parenting (Ed Code 16790)............	☐	(125)
School Improvement Program (Ed Code 52000-52040)	☐	(6)
State Pre-School Program (Ed Code 16601)........	☐	(7)
Urban Impact Aid.................................	☐	(8)
Vocational Education (PL 50-576)................	☐	(9)

16. Estimate how much of your time and the time of other administrators in your district is devoted to administering all of these publicly funded programs. Rate the overall amount of time commitment on a scale ranging from "1" if a great deal of time is spent to a "5" if almost no time is spent managing these programs.

Amount of time commitment...................... ☐ (10)

17. In your opinion, how well integrated or coordinated are the administrative and reporting requirements of the public programs in which your district participates? For each set of programs, rank the level of integration of these requirements on a scale ranging from "5" if very well integrated to "1" if not well integrated.

Coordination of state program requirements......	☐	(11)
Coordination of federal program requirements....	☐	(12)
Coordination of state with federal program requirements..................................	☐	(13)

18. Does your district perform ON-SITE INSPECTIONS(s) of any state or federal programs operating in public schools?.......................... YES ☐ 1 / NO ☐ 0 (14)

SECTION V. GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS THAT INCLUDE PRIVATE SCHOOLS

19. Does your district administer any programs in which private schools participate?................................ YES ☐ 1 / NO ☐ 0 (15)

ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ONLY IF YOU ANSWERED "YES" TO QUESTION 19.

20. Indicate in the first column those public programs in which private schools participate. In the second column, ESTIMATE the total number of private schools that participate.

	PROGRAM PARTICIPATION (Enter a '1')	ESTIMATED NO. OF PRIVATE SCHOOLS	
Children's Centers................	☐	☐☐	(16-18)
ESAA (Emergency School Aid)......	☐	☐☐	(19-21)
ESEA Title I......................	☐	☐☐	(22-24)
ESEA Title IV-B...................	☐	☐☐	(25-27)
ESEA Title IV-C...................	☐	☐☐	(28-30)
ESEA Title VII....................	☐	☐☐	(31-33)
State Bilingual Education.........	☐	☐☐	(34-36)
Handicapped Education (PL 94-142)	☐	☐☐	(37-39)
State Special Education...........	☐	☐☐	(40-42)
Indochinese Education.............	☐	☐☐	(43-45)
National School Lunch Program....	☐	☐☐	(46-48)
State Nutrition Program...........	☐	☐☐	(49-51)
State Pre-School Programs.........	☐	☐☐	(52-54)
Transportation Services (by District).........................	☐	☐☐	(55-57)
Vocational Education..............	☐	☐☐	(58-60)
Other Programs			
(specify) ____________________	☐	☐☐	(61-63)
(specify) ____________________	☐	☐☐	(64-66)
(specify) ____________________	☐	☐☐	(67-69)

21. Are any students currently enrolled in private schools in your district also dually enrolled in public school classes?.. YES ☐ 1 / NO ☐ 0 (70)

22. Do any students currently enrolled in private schools in your district utilise school district transportation services?.................... YES ☐ 1 / NO ☐ 0 (71)

If YES, estimate the number of students who use these services....... ☐☐☐ (72-74)

23. ESTIMATE the number of positions on your staff that are funded to administer or coordinate these programs in private schools... ☐☐ (75-76)

24. ESTIMATE the number of instructional or professional support staff who provide on-site services to private schools and are funded through your district.

Professional Support Personnel (e.g., resource teachers, reading specialists, psychologists)...............................	☐☐	(77-78)
School Aides (paraprofessionals)...........	☐☐	(79-80)
Other Instructional/Support Staff (specify) ____________________	☐☐	(81-82)
(specify) ____________________	☐☐	(83-84)

25. Does your district perform ON-SITE INSPECTION(S) of any publicly funded programs operating in private schools?........................... YES ☐ 1 / NO ☐ 0 (85)

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION. SIMPLY FOLD AND SEAL THE SURVEY FORM (WITH TRANSPARENT TAPE) SO THAT THE RETURN ADDRESS PRINTED BELOW IS VISIBLE AND DROP IT INTO THE MAIL. NO POSTAGE IS NECESSARY.

(1-5)

01122

NO POSTAGE
NECESSARY
IF MAILED
IN THE
UNITED STATES

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL
First Class Permit No. 196, Palo Alto, CA

Postage will be paid by

DR. JAY G. CHAMBERS
Institute for Research on Educational
Finance and Governance
CERAS Bldg. Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

PRIVATE SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS: This questionnaire should take approximately 50-60 minutes to complete. Please answer as many questions as you possibly can. You may, of course, refuse to answer any questions that you find objectionable. Since we are surveying a wide variety of public and private schools, you may also find that a very few questions or response categories are simply inapplicable to your school or its operations; please skip over them and continue. Some questions require only a check mark while others require entering a "1" or "0" when multiple responses are possible. In the remaining questions, boxes are provided for filling in the appropriate number of students, teachers, dollars, and so forth. Please ESTIMATE any of these numerical answers if they are too difficult to compute from your own records. Return of this questionnaire implies that you consent to participate in this study. We recommend that you use a lead pencil to fill in this questionnaire.

I. SCHOOL IDENTIFICATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. School Name: ______________________

2. City: ______________________

3. County: ______________________

4. Sex of students served by your school:

	Check(✓) Below		
a. All male	☐	1	(6)
b. All female	☐	2	
c. Coeducational	☐	3	

5. Type of school:

	Check(✓) Below		
a. Day school	☐	1	(7)
b. Boarding school	☐	2	
c. Combination day and boarding school	☐	3	

6. Religious affiliation of your school:

	Check(✓) Below			
a. No religious affiliation	☐	0	1	(8-9)
b. Baptist	☐	0	2	(10-11)
c. Calvinist	☐	0	3	(12-13)
d. Eastern Orthodox	☐	0	4	(14-15)
e. Episcopal	☐	0	5	(16-17)
f. Friends	☐	0	6	(18-19)
g. Jewish	☐	0	7	(20-21)
h. Lutheran	☐	0	8	(22-23)
i. Methodist	☐	0	9	(24-25)
j. Presbyterian	☐	1	0	(26-27)
k. Roman Catholic	☐	1	1	(28-29)
l. Seventh Day Adventist	☐	1	2	(30-31)
m. Other Religious	☐	1	3	(32-33)

Specify: ______________________

leave blank... ☐☐ (34-35)

7. Type of ownership and control that best characterizes your school:

	Check(✓) One Below		
a. Parochial, church affiliated	☐	1	(36)
b. Diocesan owned, parish controlled	☐	2	
c. Diocesan owned, diocesan controlled	☐	3	
d. Religious teaching order (__________)	☐	4	
e. Owned by central/regional religious ass	☐	5	
f. Other non-profit	☐	6	
g. Proprietary	☐	7	
h. Other	☐	8	

Specify: ______________________

8. Year in which school was established:

	Check(✓) Below		
a. 1975 to present	☐	1	(37)
b. Between 1970 and 1974	☐	2	
c. Between 1965 and 1969	☐	3	
d. Between 1960 and 1964	☐	4	
e. Between 1950 and 1959	☐	5	
f. Between 1930 and 1949	☐	6	
g. Between 1900 and 1929	☐	7	
h. Before 1900	☐	8	

II. STUDENT ENROLLMENTS.

9. Estimate student enrollment by RACE/ETHNIC origin:

RACE/ETHNIC GROUP	NO. OF STUDENTS	
Black—not of Hispanic origin	☐☐☐	(38-40)
Hispanic	☐☐☐	(41-43)
White—not of Hispanic origin	☐☐☐☐	(44-47)
Other (Asian or Pacific Islander, Alaskan Nat., Nat. American)	☐☐☐	(48-50)

10. Estimate the number of students who:

	NO. OF STUDENTS	
PAY FULL tuition	☐☐☐☐	(51-54)
Receive PARTIAL ASSISTANCE for tuition charges	☐☐☐	(55-57)
Receive FULL SCHOLARSHIP awards for tuition charges	☐☐☐	(58-60)

11. Estimate the percent of students who are:

	% OF STUDENTS	
Physically or mentally HANDICAPPED	☐☐	(61-62)
Educationally DISADVANTAGED	☐☐	(63-64)
Eligible to receive Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC)	☐☐	(65-66)

12. Estimate the percent of students who live within the following distances from your school:

	% OF STUDENTS	
a. Less than 2 miles	☐☐☐	(67-69)
b. 2 to 5 miles	☐☐☐	(70-72)
c. 5 to 10 miles	☐☐☐	(73-75)
d. More than 10 miles	☐☐☐	(76-78)

13. Estimate the percent of your students' families who currently live outside of California: ☐☐☐ (79-81)

% OUTSIDE CALIF

III. STAFF, STAFF COMPENSATION, AND CONTRIBUTED SERVICES

14. Complete this table by filling in the TOTAL NUMBER (full-time and part-time) of personnel who are on your school's payroll. The possible types of personnel by function are listed in column (1). Count each staff member under the one and only one category in column (1) that best characterizes that member's primary job function. If any personnel type or category does not apply to your school, simply leave the corresponding boxes blank.

STAFFING PATTERNS, 1981-82

Types of Personnel (1)	PAID STAFF (Personnel on Your School's Payroll) UNDUPLICATED COUNT Total No. Full-Time (2)	Part-Time (3)	
INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL			
Teachers			(82-85)
Teachers' aides			(86-89)
PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT PERSONNEL (e.g., counselors, librarians, nurses, chaplains, psychologists)			(90-93)
ADMINISTRATORS			
Principal/Head			(94-97)
Asst. Administrators(s)			(98-101)
Other Instructional or Program Administrator(s)			(102-105)
Business or General Administrator or Manager			(106-109)
Other Administrators: Specify: ____________			(110-113)
____________			(114-117)
SUPPORT STAFF:			
Secretary/Clerical			(118-121)
Accounting/Bookkeeping			(122-125)
Other (e.g., Custodial & Maintenance)			(6-9)

15. Estimate the level of CONTRIBUTED OR VOLUNTEER SERVICES received by your school during the most recent year for each of the following categories of services. Use the following scale:

0=None
1=1 to 10 total person-days per year
2=11 to 25 total person-days per year
3=26 to 50 total person-days per year
4=51 to 75 total person-days per year
5=75 or more total person-days per year

Professional services (e.g., physician, lawyer, accountant)		(10)
Instructional services (e.g., teachers, aides, media personnel)		(11)
Supporting services—athletic events (e.g., ticket takers, coaches)		(12)
Supporting services—other extra curricular (e.g, advisors, group leaders)		(13)
Transportation services (e.g., bus drivers, mechanics)		(14)
Maintenance services (e.g., custodian, gardener)		(15)
Fund-raising services		(16)

16. Does your school maintain a formal salary schedule for:

	YES=1 NO =0	
Teaching personnel?		(17)
Administrative personnel?		(18)

17. Indicate the lowest and highest salaries currently paid teachers and administrators on your school's payroll.

	ANNUAL SALARY	
Teachers:		
Lowest salary paid		(19-23)
Highest salary paid		(24-28)
Administrators:		
Lowest salary paid		(29-33)
Highest salary paid		(34-38)

18. Indicate the number of personnel on your school's payroll by race/ethnic origin and gender: (for descriptions of types of personnel, see Question 14)

	RACE/ETHNIC COMPOSITION				GENDER		
Types of Personnel	White	Black	Hispanic	Other Minority	Male	Female	
INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL Teachers							(39-50)
Teachers aides							(51-62)
PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT PERSONNEL							(63-74)
ADMINISTRATORS (combined)							(75-86)
SUPPORT STAFF							(87-98)

19. Indicate which of the following statements best describes the nature of any EMPLOYMENT NEGOTIATIONS on wages, hours of employment, and other terms and conditions of employment of teachers for the 1981-82 school year.

Check (✓) Below

a. Formal negotiations (i.e., negotiations that led to a written agreement) with a teacher's organization ☐ 1 (99)
b. Informal negotiations (i.e., negotiations that did not lead to a written agreement) with a teachers organization ☐ 2
c. Individual negotiations between the school and individual employees ☐ 3
d. Wages, hours, and terms and conditions of employment are essentially determined unilaterally by the school ☐ 4

20. Estimate how many JOB APPLICATIONS or inquiries for teaching positions your school received for the 1981-82 school year: NO. OF APPLIC. ☐☐☐ (100-10[illegible])

If NO applications or inquiries were received, indicate the reason.

Check One (✓)

Applications are processed at a higher administrative level ☐ 1 (103)
Teachers are recruited on the basis of a religious "calling" ☐ [illegible]
School has no need for additional staff ☐ 3

21. Does your school offer teachers tenure or provide the assurance of a continuing contract? YES ☐ 1 (104) NO ☐ 0

a. IF YES, how many years of full-time teaching are required for tenure or continuing contract? ☐☐ (105)

b. IF YES, what percentage of your teaching staff has tenure or a continuing contract? ☐☐ (106-107)

22. Indicate the number of TEACHERS on your payroll who fit each of the following categories or descriptions:

	NUMBER OF TEACHERS	
a. number of teachers who have been employed in your school for:		
less than 1 year (newly hired)		(108-109)
1 to 5 years		(110-111)
6 to 10 years		(112-113)
11 to 20 years		(114-115)
20 years or more		(116-117)
b. number of teachers who have:		
Less than a Bachelors degree		(118-119)
a Bachelors Degree, but no Masters		(120-121)
a Masters Degree or higher		(122-123)
a California teaching credential		(124-125)
a teaching credential from another state		(6-7)

c. number of teachers who have left your school during the last two years for the following reasons:

	1979-80	1980-81	
Budget cuts or declining enrollments			(8-11)
Leave of absence			(12-15)
Unsatisfactory performance			(16-19)
Retirement			(20-23)
Death			(24-27)
Other (family reasons, employment opportunities, etc.)			(28-31)

IV. STUDENT ADMISSIONS

23. Indicate the criteria used to evaluate individual students for admission. Insert a check in the appropriate box.

Criteria	REQUIRED	CONSIDERED	NOT CONSIDERED	
Academic record (grades or teacher reports)	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(32)
Achievement or aptitude test results	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(33)
Athletic ability	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(34)
Other extra-curricular activities	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(35)
Religious affiliation	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(36)
Family involvement in a particular religious organization	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(37)
Relative of alumni or current student	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(38)
Personal recommendation	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(39)
Psychological test results	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(40)
Affirmative action	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(41)
Other (specify) ____________	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(42)

24. Approximately how many individuals applied for ADMISSION for 1981-82?............ ☐☐☐ (43-45)

25. Do you have a waiting list?...............YES ☐ 1 / NO ☐ 0 (46)

a. IF YES, how many individuals are currently on your waiting list?......... ☐☐☐ (47-49)

V. EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHIES, PROGRAMS, AND POLICIES

26. Indicate the area(s) that receive particular emphasis at your school: (Enter a "1")

College preparation..............................	☐	(50)
Basic skills orientation............................	☐	(51)
Critical and original thinking stimulated.........	☐	(52)
Respect for authority instilled.....................	☐	(53)
Vocational preparation..............................	☐	(54)
Social development (cultural pluralism, etc.).....	☐	(55)
Self-esteem development............................	☐	(56)
Religious, ethical values...........................	☐	(57)
Other (specify) ____________	☐	(58)

27. What feature(s) of your school would you cite as particularly contributing to your work success as a school? (Enter a "1")

Highly dedicated teachers...........................	☐	(59)
Superior student discipline.........................	☐	(60)
Superior course offerings...........................	☐	(61)
Good parental involvement...........................	☐	(62)
Good student morale..................................	☐	(63)
Highly selected student body.........................	☐	(64)
Other (specify) ____________	☐	(65)

28. Do any of the following SPECIFIC PRACTICES contribute to your school's success? (Enter a "1")

a. Instructional Programs

School-wide use of a particular teaching method	☐	(66)
School-wide use of a particular curriculum......	☐	(67)

b. Student Evaluation

School-wide review of each student's progress..	☐	(68)
Dismissal of poor students........................	☐	(69)

29. Are the students in your school required to wear uniforms?.......................YES ☐ 1 / NO ☐ 0 (70)

30. At what grade level do you departmentalize your educational program? (Enter "NA" if not applicable)...................GRADE ☐☐ (71-72)

31. When you are hiring a new teacher, what attributes are considered to be most important? Please rate on a scale from "1" (least important) to "5" (most important) by entering a check in the appropriate space.

	Least Important 1	2	3	4	Most Important 5	
Masters Degree or higher...	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(73)
Bachelors Degree............	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(74)
Previous teaching experience	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(75)
Membership in a religious order or community.......	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(76)
Religious or other affiliations.............	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(77)
Personal lifestyle.........	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(78)
Gender......................	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(79)
Race/ethnic origin (Affirmative Action).....	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(80)
Philosophy of education....	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(81)
State Teaching Credential..	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(82)
Other professional credential (specify) ____________	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(83)
Other (specify) ____________	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(84)

VI. SCHOOL GOVERNANCE AND ENVIRONMENT

32. Does your school have its own local governing board?..............................YES ☐ 1 / NO ☐ 0 (85)

a. IF YES, how many members does it have?...................................... ☐☐ (86-87)

b. OF THESE, how many are parents of students currently enrolled in this school?... ☐☐ (88-89)

33. Is this school part of a larger administrative system?........................YES ☐ 1 / NO ☐ 0 (90)

a. IF YES, indicate the level at which this (these) administrative system(s) operate(s): Check (✓) Below

District/Diocesan..........................	☐	1	(91)
State/Regional.............................	☐	2	
National...................................	☐	3	

34. For the following decisions, indicate how much influence each of the designated positions or groups is likely to have. Record a number from the Influence Scale for each position and decision.

Influence Scale
NA- Not applicable
1 - None
2 - Little
3 - Moderate
4 - Fairly High
5 - High

Decisions	Administrative System Office	Local School Governing Board	Pastor/Rabbi	Principal/Head	Faculty	Parent Group	
a. adopting a major change in curriculum..	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(92-97)
b. hiring a new teacher................	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(98-103)
c. dismissing a teacher.............	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(104-109)
d. determining student admission policies....	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(110-115)
e. defining school budget	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(116-121)

35. Does the principal/head of the school function:

Check only one:

Primarily, as the instructional leader of the school........................ ☐ 1 (122)
Primarily, as the administrative manager of the school, delegating instructional decisions to teachers........................ ☐ 2
As both instructional leader and administrative manager................................ ☐ 3
As none of above. Primary function is: ________________________________ ☐ 4

36. What types of information does your school collect on a regular basis? Enter a "1" in the first column opposite each item of information collected by your school. Enter a "1" in the second column if you were required to collect this information by some public agency.

TYPE OF INFORMATION	INFORMATION COLLECTED (Enter a "1")	COLLECTION REQUIRED BY PUBLIC AGENCY (Enter a "1")	
achievement test scores...............	☐	☐	(6-7)
numbers of students admitted to other institutions (e.g., prep schools, colleges)...........................	☐	☐	(8-9)
systematic surveys of student attitudes, satisfaction............	☐	☐	(10-11)
systematic surveys of parental attitudes, satisfaction............	☐	☐	(12-13)
systematic data on teacher performance in the classroom..........	☐	☐	(14-15)
systematic data on teacher qualifications, credentials...............	☐	☐	(16-17)
information on prizes, scholarships won by students.....................	☐	☐	(18-19)
other (specify)________________	☐	☐	(20-21)
______________________________	☐	☐	(22-23)

37. Indicate how information about your school and its program priorities are communicated to interested parties outside the school.

(Enter a "1")

Written brochure/program descriptions........... ☐ (24)
Advertising in public media (newspapers, periodicals, etc.)................................ ☐ (25)
Public presentations by school administrator(s)................................ ☐ (26)
Regular visits to feeder schools or supporting organizations, e.g., churches, etc........ ☐ (27)
Use of public relations specialist............... ☐ (28)
Reliance on school reputation, word-of-mouth.... ☐ (29)
Private or church related publications.......... ☐ (30)

38. Is your school accredited by an outside organization?.........................
YES ☐ 1 (31)
NO ☐ 0

If YES, check or specify the accrediting agency(ies).

(Enter a "1")

California Association of Independent Schools.. ☐ (32)
Western Association of Schools and Colleges.. ☐ (33)
Western Catholic Education Association.......... ☐ (34)
General Conference of Seventh-Day Adventists.. ☐ (35)
Montessori Associations International.......... ☐ (36)
Other, specify: ______________________ ... ☐ (37)

39. Specify the regional or national association(s) that are affiliated with your school. (Omit associations in which individua's within your school might have membership; i.e., professional groups.)

(Enter a "1")

American Lutheran Education Association...... ☐ (38)
Baptist Day School Association................ ☐ (39)
California Association of Independent Schools (40)
California Catholic Conference................ ☐ (41)
Christian Schools International............... ☐ (42)
Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod............... ☐ (43)
National Association of Hebrew Schools....... ☐ (44)
Pacific Union of Conference of Seventh Day Adventists.............................. ☐ (45)
Other, specify: ______________________________ ☐ (46)

40. Are there any WRITTEN GUIDELINES that specify how a teacher could appeal an administrative decision concerning evaluation, pay, promotion, or discipline?..............................
YES ☐ 1 (47)
NO ☐ 0

IF YES:

a. Were these written guidelines established within your school or by the larger administrative system that includes your school?...............
SCHOOL ☐ 1 (48)
LARGER SYSTEM ☐ 0

b. To the best of your knowledge, in what year were written guidelines for appeals first established?............19 ☐☐ (49-50)

c. Are the written guidelines for appeals the result of negotiations with a teachers' organization?.........................
YES ☐ 1 (51)
NO ☐ 0

d. According to the written guidelines, which of the following persons or groups are designated to review teacher appeals? (Enter a "1")

Department chair........................... ☐ (52)
Principal, headmaster, president........... ☐ (53)
Pastor/Rabbi................................ ☐ (54)
Diocese administrator or governing board... ☐ (55)
Specially designated officer, ombudsman, or committee.................................. ☐ (56)
Arbitration or mediation committee......... ☐ (57)
Other (please specify) __________________ ☐ (58)

VII. GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

41. Does your school or do the students enrolled in your school participate in ANY PUBLICLY FUNDED PROGRAM involving local, state, or federal agencies, including dual enrollment programs in public colleges or schools?...............
YES ☐ 1 (59)
NO ☐ 0

IF NO, SKIP TO SECTION VIII (Q. 52): SCHOOL FINANCE AND BUDGETS

42. Estimate how many students currently enrolled in your school participate in the following publicly funded LOCAL PROGRAMS. If students do not participate. indicate with NA.

Dual Enrollment in:	NUMBER OF STUDENTS PARTICIPATING	
College Classes........................	☐☐☐	(60-62)
Vocational Education Classes...........	☐☐☐	(63-65)
Other Public School (K-12) Classes.....	☐☐☐	(66-68)
District/County School Transportation Services................................	☐☐☐	(69-71)
On-Site Public Health and Welfare Services................................	☐☐☐	(72-74)

43. Does your school participate in FEDERAL child nutrition programs, including school breakfast, milk, or lunch programs?
YES ☐ 1 (75)
NO ☐ 0

44. Do the students in your school receive benefits from the following FEDERAL PROGRAMS?

a. School library materials programs (e.g., former ESEA Title IV-B)
YES ☐ 1 (76)
NO ☐ 0

b. School district desegregation activities (e.g., former ESAA)
YES ☐ 1 (77)
NO ☐ 0

45. Estimate how many students currently enrolled in your school participate in the following FEDERAL PROGRAMS. If students do not participate, indicate with NA.

	NUMBER OF STUDENTS PARTICIPATING	
Compensatory Education (e.g., former ESEA-Title I)	☐☐☐	(78-80)
Bilingual Education (e.g., ESEA Title VII)	☐☐☐	(81-83)
Handicapped Education (e.g., PL 94-142)	☐☐☐	(84-86)

46. Estimate how many students currently enrolled in your school participate in the following STATE PROGRAMS. If students do not participate, indicate with NA.

	NUMBER OF STUDENTS PARTICIPATING	
Handicapped Education	☐☐☐	(87-89)
Other (specify): ______________	☐☐☐	(90-92)
______________	☐☐☐	(93-95)

47. Estimate the number of staff who work in your school but are paid by public funds ☐☐☐ (96-97)

48. Estimate how much of your time and the time of other administrators in your school is devoted to administering all of these publicly funded programs. Rate the overall amount of time commitment on a scale ranging from "1" if a great deal of time is spent to a" 5" if almost no time is spent on managing these programs.

Amount of time commitment ☐ (98)

49. In your opinion, how well integrated or coordinated are the administrative and reporting requirements of the public programs in which your school or your students participate? For each set of programs, rank the level of integration of these requirements on a scale ranging from "5" if very well integrated to "1" if not well integrated. If program involvement by your school and/or students is not adequate for you to answer this question, indicate with NA.

Coordination of state program requirements ☐ (99)
Coordination of federal program requirements ☐ (100)
Coordination of state and federal program requirements ☐ (101)

50. With which of the following public agencies does your school have direct contact in the administration of publicly funded programs? (Contact not mediated by another agency.) If no direct contact, state NONE.

Public school district(s). Specify: ______________ (102)
____
Other local public agencies. Specify: ______________ (103)
____
State offices. Specify: ______________ (104)
____
Federal agencies. Specify: ______________ (105)
____

51. List those federal, state, or local agencies that perform ON SITE INSPECTION of publicly funded programs within the last three years.

______________ (106)
____
____

VIII. SCHOOL FINANCE AND BUDGETS

52. Indicate the ANNUAL TUITION (excluding room and board) charged for the majority of students served by your school.

a. ANNUAL TUITION for lowest grade level:
First child from family ☐☐☐☐ (107-110)
Second child from family ☐☐☐☐ (111-114)

b. ANNUAL TUITION for highest grade level:
First child from family ☐☐☐☐ (115-118)
Second child from family ☐☐☐☐ (119-122)

53. If your school provides room and board for some students, what do you charge for full room and board? ROOM & BOARD ☐☐☐☐ (6-9)

54. Does your school offer transportation services?
YES ☐ 1 (10)
NO ☐ 0

IF YES:

a. Indicate the range of transportation fees charged. (round to nearest $)
Lowest transportation fee ☐☐☐ (11-13)
Highest transportation fee ☐☐☐ (14-16)

b. Do these fees cover the total costs of home to school transportation services provided by your school?
YES ☐ 1 (17)
NO ☐ 0

c. How many of your students take advantage of these transportation services? ☐☐☐ (18-20)

55. Indicate actual revenues (CASH TRANSFERS) for the 1980-81 school year:

TOTAL SCHOOL REVENUES INVOLVING CASH TRANSFERS

ACTUAL REVENUES, 1980-81

SOURCES OF REVENUE:

Tuition and fees..........	☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	(21-27)
Parish or Church contributions............	☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	(28-34)
Individual or Corporate donations or gifts.....	☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	(35-41)
Income from investments reserves or endowment..	☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	(42-48)
Specify other sources:		
______________....	☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	(49-55)
______________....	☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	(56-62)
TOTAL ANNUAL OPERATING REVENUE........	☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	(63-69)

56. Indicate the total current operating budget for the 1980-81 school year:

TOTAL EXPENDITURES, 1980-81

INSTRUCTIONAL—Salaries and Benefits...........	☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	(70-76)
INSTRUCTIONAL—Other Expenses................	☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	(77-83)
ADMINISTRATION—Salaries and Benefits...........	☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	(84-90)
ADMINISTRATION—Other Expenses................	☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	(91-97)
OTHER—Salaries and Benefits................	☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	(98-104)
OTHER—Expenses..........	☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	(105-111)
TOTAL BUDGET.............	☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	(112-118)

57. Does your school RENT OR LEASE the school site and buildings?..................... YES ☐ 1 (119) NO ☐ 0

IF YES:

a. What was your expected annual rental or lease costs for the 1980-81 academic year?....... ☐☐☐☐☐☐ (6-11)

b. Do you rent your school facility from a public school district?........... YES ☐ 1 (12) NO ☐ 0

c. Is your rental payment subsidized by a church or other religious organization(s)?............................ YES ☐ 1 (13) NO ☐ 0

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION. SIMPLY FOLD AND SEAL THE SURVEY FORM (WITH TRANSPARENT TAPE) SO THAT THE RETURN ADDRESS PRINTED BELOW IS VISIBLE AND DROP IT INTO THE MAIL. NO POSTAGE IS NECESSARY.

(1-5)

NO POSTAGE
NECESSARY
IF MAILED
IN THE
UNITED STATES

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL
First Class Permit No. 196, Palo Alto, CA

Postage will be paid by

DR. JAY G. CHAMBERS
Institute for Research on Educational
Finance and Governance
CERAS Bldg. Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

CATHOLIC SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS: This questionnaire should take approximately 30-35 minutes to complete. Please answer as many questions as you possibly can. You may, of course, refuse to answer any questions that you find objectionable. Since we are surveying a wide variety of public and private schools, you may also find that a very few questions or response categories are simply inapplicable to your school or its operations; please skip over them and continue. Some questions require only a check mark while others require entering a "1" or "0" when multiple responses are possible. In the remaining questions, boxes are provided for filling in the appropriate number of students, teachers, dollars, and so forth. Please ESTIMATE any of these numerical answers if they are too difficult to compute from your own records. Return of this questionnaire implies that you consent to participate in this study. We recommend that you use a lead pencil to fill in this questionnaire.

I. SCHOOL IDENTIFICATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. School Name:______________________________

2. City:______________________________

3. County:______________________________

II. STUDENT ENROLLMENTS

4. Estimate student enrollment by RACE/ETHNIC origin:

RACE/ETHNIC GROUP	NO. OF STUDENTS	
Black—not of Hispanic origin......		(6-8)
Hispanic...........................		(9-11)
White—not of Hispanic origin......		(12-15)
Other (Asian or Pacific Islander, Alaskan Nat., Nat. American)......		(16-18)

5. Estimate the number of students who:

	NO. OF STUDENTS	
PAY FULL tuition..................		(19-22)
Receive PARTIAL ASSISTANCE for tuition charges................		(23-25)
Receive FULL SCHOLARSHIP awards for tuition charges.............		(26-28)

6. Estimate the percent of students who are:

	% OF STUDENTS	
Physically or mentally HANDICAPPED		(29-31)
Educationally DISADVANTAGED........		(32-34)
Eligible to receive Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC)....		(35-37)

7. Estimate the percent of students who live within the following distances from your school:

	% OF STUDENTS	
a. Less than 2 miles................		(38-40)
b. 2 to 5 miles.....................		(41-43)
c. 5 to 10 miles....................		(44-46)
d. More than 10 miles...............		(47-49)

8. Estimate the percent of your students' families who currently live outside of California?

	% OUTSIDE CALIF	
outside of California?................		(50-52)

III. STAFF, STAFF COMPENSATION, AND CONTRIBUTED SERVICES

9. Complete this table by filling in the TOTAL NUMBER (full-time and part-time) of personnel who are on your school's payroll. The possible types of personnel by function are listed in column (1). Count each staff member under the one and only one category in column (1) that best characterizes that member's primary job function. If any personnel type or category does not apply to your school, simply leave the corresponding boxes blank.

STAFFING PATTERNS, 1981-62

Types of Personnel (1)	PAID STAFF (Personnel on Your School's Payroll) UNDUPLICATED COUNT Total No. Full-Time (2)	Part-Time (3)	
ADMINISTRATORS			
Principal/Head................			(53-56)
Asst. Administrators(s)......			(57-60)
Other Instructional or Program Administrator(s)...			(61-64)
Business or General Administrator or Manager...			(65-68)
Other Administrators: Specify:__________..			(69-72)
______________..			(73-76)

10. Estimate the level of CONTRIBUTED OR VOLUNTEER SERVICES received by your school during the most recent year for each of the following categories of services. Use the following scale:

0=None
1=1 to 10 total person-days per year
2=11 to 25 total person-days per year
3=26 to 50 total person-days per year
4=51 to 75 total person-days per year
5=75 or more total person-days per year

Professional services (e.g., physician, lawyer, accountant)..........................		(77)
Instructional services (e.g., teachers, aides, media personnel)....................		(78)
Supporting services—athletic events (e.g., ticket takers, coaches).................		(79)
Supporting services—other extra curricular (e.g, advisors, group leaders)..........		(80)
Transportation services (e.g., bus drivers, mechanics).............................		(81)
Maintenance services (e.g., custodian, gardener).............................		(82)
Fund-raising services.......................		(83)

11. Indicate the lowest and highest salaries currently paid lay teachers and lay administrators on your school's payroll.

	ANNUAL SALARY	
Lay Teachers:		
Lowest salary paid......	☐☐☐☐☐	(84-88)
Highest salary paid......	☐☐☐☐☐	(89-93)
Lay Administrators:		
Lowest salary paid......	☐☐☐☐☐	(94-98)
Highest salary paid......	☐☐☐☐☐	(99-103)

12. Number of personnel on your school's payroll by race/ethnic origin:

Types of Personnel	White	Black	Hispanic	
INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL Teachers....................	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	(6-11)
Teachers' aides............	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	(12-17)
PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT PERSONNEL (e.g., counselors, librarians, chaplains).....	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	(18-23)
ADMINISTRATORS (all types)...	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	(24-29)
SUPPORT STAFF (e.g., clerical, custodial).......	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	(30-35)

13. Indicate which of the following statements best describes the nature of any EMPLOYMENT NEGOTIATIONS on wages, hours of employment, and other terms and conditions of employment of teachers for the 1981-82 school year.

	Check (✓) Only One Below	
a. Formal negotiations (i.e., negotiations that led to a written agreement) with a teacher's organization................	☐ 1	(36)
b. Informal negotiations (i.e., negotiations that did not lead to a written agreement) with a teachers organization.......	☐ 2	
c. Individual negotiations between the school and individual employees.........	☐ 3	
d. Wages, hours, and terms and conditions of employment are essentially determined unilaterally by the school........	☐ 4	

14. Indicate the number of teachers who have left your school during the last two years for the following reasons:

	1979-80	1980-81	
Budget cuts or declining enrollments.................	☐☐	☐☐	(37-40)
Leave of absence..............	☐☐	☐☐	(41-44)
Unsatisfactory performance....	☐☐	☐☐	(45-48)
Retirement....................	☐☐	☐☐	(49-52)
Death.........................	☐☐	☐☐	(53-56)
Other (family reasons, employment opportunities, etc.)...	☐☐	☐☐	(57-60)

IV. STUDENT ADMISSIONS

15. Indicate the criteria used to evaluate individual students for admission. Insert a check in the appropriate box.

Criteria	REQUIRED	CONSIDERED	NOT CONSIDERED	
Academic record (grades or teacher reports)..	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(61)
Achievement or aptitude test results.........	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(62)
Athletic ability.............................	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(63)
Other extra curricular activities............	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(64)
Religious affiliation........................	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(65)
Family involvement in a particular religious organization......................	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(66)
Relative of alumni or current student........	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(67)
Personal recommendation......................	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(68)
Psychological test results...................	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(69)
Affirmative action...........................	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(70)
Other (specify) ____________________	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	(71)

16. Approximately how many individuals applied for ADMISSION for 1981-82? ☐☐☐ (72-74)

17. Do you have a waiting list? YES ☐ 1 NO ☐ 0 (75)

a. IF YES, how many individuals are currently on your waiting list? ☐☐☐ (76-78)

V. EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHIES, PROGRAMS, AND POLICIES

18. Indicate the area(s) that receive particular emphasis at your school:

	(Enter a '1')	
College preparation	☐	(79)
Basic skills orientation	☐	(80)
Critical and original thinking stimulated	☐	(81)
Respect for authority instilled	☐	(82)
Vocational preparation	☐	(83)
Social development (cultural pluralism, etc.)	☐	(84)
Self-esteem development	☐	(85)
Religious, ethical values	☐	(86)
Other (specify) ____________	☐	(87)

19. What feature(s) would you cite as particularly contributing to your success as a school?

	(Enter a '1')	
Highly dedicated teachers	☐	(88)
Superior student discipline	☐	(89)
Superior course offerings	☐	(90)
Good parental involvement	☐	(91)
Good student morale	☐	(92)
Highly selected student body	☐	(93)
Other (specify) ____________	☐	(94)

20. Do any of the following SPECIFIC PRACTICES contribute to your school's success?

	(Enter a '1')	
a. Instructional Programs		
School-wide use of a particular teaching method	☐	(95)
School-wide use of a particular curriculum	☐	(96)
b. Student Evaluation		
School-wide review of each student's progress	☐	(97)
Dismissal of poor students	☐	(98)

21. Are the students in your school required to wear uniforms? YES ☐ 1 NO ☐ 0 (99)

22. At what grade level do you departmentalize your educational program? (Enter "NA" if not applicable) GRADE ☐☐ (100-101)

23. When you are hiring a new teacher, what attributes are considered to be most important? Please rate on a scale from "1" (least important) to "5" (most important) by entering a check in the appropriate space.

	Least Important 1	2	3	4	Most Important 5	
Masters Degree or higher	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(102)
Bachelors Degree	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(103)
Previous teaching experience	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(104)
Membership in a religious order or community	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(105)
Religious or other affiliations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(106)
Personal lifestyle	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(107)
Gender	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(108)
Race/ethnic origin (Affirmative Action)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(109)
Philosophy of education	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(110)
State Teaching Credential	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(111)
Other professional credential (specify) ____________	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(112)
Other (specify) ____________	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(113)

VI. SCHOOL GOVERNANCE AND ENVIRONMENT

24. Does your school have its own local governing board? YES ☐ 1 NO ☐ 0 (114)

a. IF YES, how many members does it have? ☐☐ (115-116)

b. OF THESE, how many are parents of students currently enrolled in this school? ☐☐ (117-118)

25. Does the principal/head of the school function:

Check only one:

Primarily, as the instructional leader of the school ☐ 1 (119)

Primarily, as the administrative manager of the school, delegating instructional decisions to teachers ☐ 2

As both instructional leader and administrative manager ☐ 3

As none of above. Primary function is: ____________ ☐ 4

26. For the following decisions, indicate how much influence each of the designated positions or groups is likely to have. Record a number from the Influence Scale for each position and decision.

Influence Scale
NA- Not applicable
1 - None
2 - Little
3 - Moderate
4 - Fairly High
5 - High

Decisions	Administrative System Office	Local School Governing Board	Pastor/Rabbi	Principal/Head	Faculty	Parent Group	
a. adopting a major change in curriculum	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(6-11)
b. hiring a new teacher	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(12-17)
c. dismissing a teacher	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(18-23)
d. determining student admission policies	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(24-29)
e. defining school budget	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	(30-35)

27. What types of information does your school collect on a regular basis? Enter a "1" in the first column opposite each item of information collected by your school. Enter a "1" in the second column if you were required to collect this information by some public agency.

TYPE OF INFORMATION	INFORMATION COLLECTED (Enter a '1')	COLLECTION REQUIRED BY PUBLIC AGENCY (Enter a "1")	
achievement test scores..............	☐	☐	(36-37)
numbers of students admitted to other institutions (e.g., prep schools, colleges).........................	☐	☐	(38-39)
systematic surveys of student attitudes, satisfaction............	☐	☐	(40-41)
systematic surveys of parental attitudes, satisfaction............	☐	☐	(42-43)
systematic data on teacher performance in the classroom..........	☐	☐	(44-45)
systematic data on teacher qualifications, credentials...............	☐	☐	(46-47)
information on prizes, scholarships won by students....................	☐	☐	(48-49)
other (specify)________________	☐	☐	(50-51)
________________	☐	☐	(52-53)

28. Indicate how information about your school and its program priorities are communicated to interested parties outside the school.

	(Enter a '1')	
Written brochure/program descriptions...........	☐	(54)
Advertising in public media (newspapers, periodicals, etc.)................................	☐	(55)
Public presentations by school administrator(s)................................	☐	(56)
Regular visits to feeder schools or supporting organizations, e.g. churches, etc..........	☐	(57)
Use of public relations specialist...............	☐	(58)
Reliance on school reputation, word-of-mouth....	☐	(59)
Private or church related publications..........	☐	(60)

29. Is your school accredited by an outside organization?

YES	☐	1	(61)
NO	☐	0	

If YES, check or specify the accrediting agency(ies).

	Enter a "1"	
California Association of Independent Schools.....................................	☐	(62)
Western Association of Schools and Colleges....................................	☐	(63)
Western Catholic Education Association.....	☐	(64)
General Conference of Seventh-Day Adventists..................................	☐	(65)
Montessori Associations International.....	☐	(66)
Other, specify: ________________	☐	(67)

VII. GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

30. Does your school or do the students enrolled in your school participate in ANY PUBLICLY FUNDED PROGRAM involving local, state, or federal agencies, including dual enrollment programs in public colleges or schools?

YES ☐ 1 (68)
NO ☐ 0

IF NO, SKIP TO SECTION VIII (Q. 39): SCHOOL FINANCE AND BUDGET

31. Estimate how many students currently enrolled in your school participate in the following publicly funded LOCAL PROGRAMS. If students do not participate, indicate with NA.

Dual Enrollment in:	NO. STUDENTS PARTICIPATING	
College Classes	☐☐☐	(69-71)
Vocational Education Classes	☐☐☐	(72-74)
Other Public School (K-12) Classes	☐☐☐	(75-77)
District/County School Transportation Services	☐☐☐	(78-80)
On-Site Public Health and Welfare Services	☐☐☐	(81-83)

32. Estimate how many students currently enrolled in your school participate in the following FEDERAL PROGRAMS. If students do not participate, indicate with NA.

	NO. STUDENTS PARTICIPATING	
Compensatory Education (e.g., former ESEA-Title I)	☐☐☐	(84-86)
Bilingual Education (e.g., ESEA Title VII)	☐☐☐	(87-89)
Handicapped Education (e.g., PL 94-142)	☐☐☐	(90-92)

33. Estimate how many students currently enrolled in your school participate in the following STATE PROGRAMS. If students do not participate, indicate with NA.

	NO. STUDENTS PARTICIPATING	
Handicapped Education	☐☐☐	(93-95)
Other (specify): ____________	☐☐☐	(96-98)
____________	☐☐☐	(99-101)
____________	☐☐☐	(102-104)

34. Estimate the number of staff who work in your school but are paid by public funds ☐☐ (105-106)

35. Estimate how much of your time and the time of other administrators in your school is devoted to administering all of these publicly funded programs. Rate the overall amount of time commitment on a scale ranging from "1" if a great deal of time is spent to a "5" if almost no time is spent on managing these programs.

Amount of time commitment ☐ (107)

36. In your opinion, how well integrated or coordinated are the administrative and reporting requirements of the public programs in which your school or your students participate? For each set of programs, rank the level of integration of these requirements on a scale ranging from "5" if very well integrated to "1" if not well integrated. If program involvement by your school and/or students is not adequate for you to answer this question, indicate with NA.

Coordination of state program requirements ☐ (108)
Coordination of federal program requirements ☐ (109)
Coordination of state and federal program requirements ☐ (110)

37. With which of the following public agencies does your school have direct contact in the administration of publicly funded programs. (Contact not mediated by another agency). If no direct contact, state NONE.

Public school district(s). Specify: ____________ (111)

Other local public agencies. Specify: ____________ (112)

State offices. Specify: ____________ (113)

Federal agencies. Specify: ____________ (114)

38. List those federal, state, or local agencies that perform ON SITE INSPECTION of publicly funded programs within the last three years.

____________ (115)

VIII. SCHOOL FINANCE AND BUDGETS

39. If your school provides room and board for some students, what do you charge for full room and board?

ROOM & BOARD ☐☐☐☐ (116-119)

40. Does your school offer transportation services?

YES ☐ 1 (120)
NO ☐ 0

IF YES:

a. Indicate the range of transportation fees charged per year. (round to nearest $)

Lowest transportation fee ☐☐☐ (6-8)
Highest transportation fee ☐☐☐ (9-11)

b. Do these fees cover the total costs of home to school transportation services provided by your school?

YES ☐ 1 (12)
NO ☐ 0

c. How many of your students take advantage of these transportation services? ☐☐☐ (13-15)

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION. SIMPLY FOLD AND SEAL THE SURVEY FORM (WITH TRANSPARENT TAPE) SO THAT THE RETURN ADDRESS PRINTED BELOW IS VISIBLE AND DROP IT INTO THE MAIL. NO POSTAGE IS NECESSARY.

(1-5)

NO POSTAGE
NECESSARY
IF MAILED
IN THE
UNITED STATES

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL
First Class Permit No. 196, Palo Alto, CA

Postage will be paid by

DR. JAY G. CHAMBERS
Institute for Research on Educational
Finance and Governance
CERAS Bldg. Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

IFG
Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
STANFORD UNIVERSITY

Dear School Principal or Head:

Enclosed with this letter is a SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE. This survey is part of a major study of public and private education in the six-county San Francisco Bay Area. The research is being conducted by the Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance (IFG) at Stanford University and is funded by the National Institute of Education (NIE). The overall purpose of the study is to explore variations across schooling organizations in student enrollments, staffing patterns, educational goals and practices, organizational structures and linkages, school governance, decision making processes, and resource allocation patterns.

Your decision to participate in this effort is, of course, voluntary. However, the success of the study in capturing the great diversity of elementary and secondary schools in the Bay Area depends critically upon your cooperation. We sincerely hope that you will choose to participate in our study by completing and returning the enclosed questionnaire to us.

We recognize that some of the information being requested from your school may be sensitive. The researchers at IFG have had considerable experience in survey research and are committed to maintaining strict anonymity of responses. School identification is requested for the sole purpose of eventually matching data gathered from other sources and surveys. Individual school identifications will be deleted from the files once the remaining data on individuals and regional characteristics have been matched. Data will never be reported in such a way as to permit identification of any individual school.

In return for your participation, IFG will provide you with a summary sheet containing the responses to the survey questions from the entire sample. These responses will be divided into meaningful categories so that you may compare your school with other schools in the Bay Area. Copies of reports prepared as a part of this project will also be made available to you upon request free of charge.

After you have completed the questionnaire, simply refold it so that the Business Reply Permit and IFG address are visible, and then drop it into the mail. NO POSTAGE IS NECESSARY.

If you have any questions about the survey or the study, please call my office at (415) 497-9443 or (415) 497-3440 for messages. Furthermore, if you are dissatisfied with any procedural aspects of this study, you may anonymously report grievances to the Sponsored Projects Office of Stanford University (415) 497-3638. Let me thank you in advance for participating.

Yours sincerely,

Jay G. Chambers

Dr. Jay G. Chambers
Associate Director

THIS QUESTIONNAIRE HAS BEEN APPROVED BY THE
STANFORD UNIVERSITY HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW PANEL. 290

CERAS Building, STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305 (415) 497-0957

CODE SHEET (SIDE 1)

SECTION A: COLLEGE CODES (QUESTION #2)

PLEASE NOTE: The following institutions are in alphabetical order by state. The only exception is California which is located first for convenience. Due to space limitations, only a limited number of colleges and universities could be listed. If the institution at which you received your degree is not listed still RECORD THE NAME AND LOCATION on the lines provided in question #2 and use the code 9999. If the institution is outside the U.S., use the code 9998.

California
0004 Azusa Pacific College
0018 California Inst of Tech
0019 California Lutheran Col.

Calif. State Colleges
and Universities
0096 Bakersfield
0023 Chico
0008 Dominguez Hills
0029 Fresno
0014 Fullerton
0021 Hayward
0033 Humboldt
0015 Long Beach
0016 Los Angeles
0057 Northridge
0010 Pomona Poly
0055 Sacramento
0009 San Bernardino
0056 San Diego
0059 San Francisco
0062 San Jose
0011 San Luis Obispo (Poly)
0066 Sonoma
0072 Stanislaus
0022 Chapman College
0024 Claremont Men's Col.
0027 College of Notre Dame
0028 Dominican Col San Rafael
0026 Holy Names College
0035 Immaculate Heart Col.
0041 Loyola Marymount Univ.
0044 Mills College
0099 Monterey Inst of For Stud.
0045 Mount St. Mary's Col.
0047 Occidental College
0049 Pacific Union College
0050 Pasadena College
0052 Pepperdine Univ.
0054 Pomona College
0069 St. Mary's Col. Calif.
0070 St. Patrick's Col.
0064 Scripps College
0071 Stanford University
0089 U.S. Internat. Univ.
Univ. of California
0073 Berkeley
0074 Davis
0075 Irvine
0076 Los Angeles
0077 Riverside
0078 San Diego
0079 San Francisco
0080 Santa Barbara
0081 Santa Cruz
0037 Univ. of La Verne
0088 Univ. of the Pacific
0086 Univ. of Redlands
0083 Univ. of San Diego
0084 Univ. of San Francisco
0087 Univ. of Santa Clara
0085 Univ. of Southern Cal.
0090 Westmont College
0091 Whittier College

Alabama
1003 Alabama State Col.
1022 Tuskegee Institute
1023 Univ. Ala. Main Campus

Alaska
1102 Univ Alaska Main Campus

Arizona
1200 Arizona State Univ.
1202 Northern Arizona Univ.
1203 Univ. of Arizona

Arkansas
1302 Ark St Univ Main Campus
1308 Harding Col Main Campus
1309 Henderson State College
1311 John Brown University
1314 Philander Smith Col.
1318 Univ Ark Main Campus

Colorado
1400 Adams State College
1401 Colorado College
1403 Colorado State Col.
1404 Colorado State Univ.
1413 Univ Colo Main Campus
1414 University of Denver
1415 Wstrn State Col Colo.

Connecticut
1511 Southern Conn State Col.
1526 Yale University

Delaware
1601 University of Delaware

District of Columbia
1700 American University
1707 George Washington Univ

Florida
1805 Florida A&M University
1810 Florida State Univ.
1819 Univ. of Florida
1823 Nova University
1825 Univ. of Sarasota

Georgia
1930 University of Georgia

Hawaii
2007 Univ Hawaii Main Campus

Idaho
2101 College of Idaho
2102 Idaho State University
2104 Northwest Nazarene Col.
2105 University of Idaho
2106 Northern Idaho Col. of Ed.

Illinois
2207 Chicago State College
2209 College of St. Francis
2214 Eastern Illinois Univ
2215 Elmhurst College
2221 Illinois State University
2224 Knox College
2228 Loyola University
2240 Northeastern Ill St. Col.
2242 Northern Illinois Univ.
2243 Northwestern University
2252 Southern Illinois Univ.
2259 Univ of Ill Main Campus
2260 University of Chicago
2261 Western Illinois Univ.

Indiana
2300 Anderson College
2301 Ball State University
2324 Indiana State University
2325 Indiana Univ-Main Campus
2333 Purdue Univ Main Campus
2345 Univ. of Notre Dame
2346 Valparaiso University

Iowa
2402 Central Univ. of Iowa
2403 Clarke College
2404 Coe College
2407 Dordt College
2408 Drake University
2411 Grinnell College
2412 Iowa St. U of Sci & Tech.
2417 Morningside College
2421 Simpson College
2424 Univ of Northern Iowa
2425 University of Iowa
2426 Upper Iowa University

Kansas
2504 Fort Hays Kans State Col.
2506 Kans St Col of Pittsburg
2507 Kans St Tchrs Col Emporia
2508 Kansas St U AG & App Sci
2523 University of Kansas
2524 Washburn Univ of Topeka
2525 Wichita State University

Kentucky
2621 Univ Ky Main Campus
2625 Wstrn Kentucky University

Louisiana
2700 Centenary College
2703 Grambling College
2708 La St Univ Main Campus
2712 McNeese State College
2716 Southern Univ & A&M Col.
2720 Univ Sthwstrn Louisiana
2721 Xavier University

Maine
2817 Univ Maine Main Campus

Maryland
2925 Univ Md Main Campus

Massachusetts
3009 Boston Col Main Campus
3011 Boston University
3025 Lesley College
3042 Springfield College
3045 State Col at Fitchburg
3056 Univ Mass Amherst Campus
3061 Wheelock College

Michigan
3106 Central Michigan Univ.
3112 Eastern Michigan Univ.
3126 Mich St Univ Main Campus
3142 University of Michigan

Minnesota
3201 Bemidji State College
3216 Macalester College
3217 Mankato State College
3223 St Cloud State College
3230 U of Minn Mpls St. Paul
3232 Winona State College

Mississippi
3300 Alcorn A & M College
3313 Univ Miss Main Campus
3314 Univ of Sthrn Mississippi

Missouri
3407 Centrl Mo St Col Main Cam
3412 Harris Teachers College
3415 Lincoln University
3423 Northwest Missouri St Col
3425 Park College
3430 Southwest Missouri St Col
3433 St Louis U Main Campus
3437 Univ Missouri at Columbia
3438 Univ Missouri at Kans City
3441 Washington University

Montana
3504 Montana State University
3507 University of Montana
3509 Western Montana College

Nebraska
3610 Kearney State College
3611 Midland Lutheran College
3613 Nebraska Wesleyan Univ
3614 Peru State College
3616 Univ Nebraska Main Campus
3618 Univ Nebraska, Lincoln

Nevada
3701 Univ Nevada Main Campus

New Hampshire
3817 Univ of New Hampshire

New Jersey
3920 Rutgers The St U Main Cam.

New Mexico
4001 Eastern New Mexico Univ.
4005 New Mexico Highlands Univ
4007 University of New Mexico
4008 Western New Mexico Univ.

New York
4117 Columbia Univ Main Div.
4119 Cornell Univ Main Campus
4120 CUNY Brooklyn College
4121 CUNY City College
4122 CUNY Hunter College
4124 CUNY Queens College
4130 Fordham University
4134 Hobart & Wm Smith College
4136 Houghton College
4144 Ladycliff College
4167 New York University
4187 St Bonaventure University
4190 St Johns University
4199 SUNY College Brockport
4200 SUNY College Buffalo
4201 SUNY College Cortland
4202 SUNY College Fredonia
4203 SUNY College Geneseo
4204 SUNY College New Paltz
4205 SUNY College Oneonta
4206 SUNY College Oswego
4208 SUNY College Potsdam
4213 SUNY State Univ Albany
4215 Syracuse U. Main Campus
4218 University of Rochester
4219 Vassar College

North Carolina
4301 Appalachian St University
4307 Bennett College
4318 Guilford College
4329 N C St U Raleigh Main Cam
4342 Univ of N C at Greensboro
4343 Univ of N C at Chapel Hill
4387 Western Carolina Univ

North Dakota
4400 Dickinson State College
4403 Mayville State College
4404 Minot State College
4406 Univ N Dak Ellendale Ctr
4407 Univ N Dak Main Campus
4408 Valley City State College

Ohio
4501 Ashland College
4509 Bowling Grn St U Main Cam
4513 Case Western Reserve Univ
4523 College of Wooster
4531 Hiram College
4547 Kent St Univ Main Campus
4548 Miami Univ Oxford Campus
4556 Ohio Nthrn U Main Campus
4561 Ohio St Univ Main Campus
4566 Ohio Univ Main Campus
4574 U Cincinnati Main Campus
4575 University of Akron
4576 University of Dayton
4577 University of Toledo
4583 Wittenberg University
4585 Youngstown St University

Oklahoma
4600 Bethany Nazarene College
4602 Central State College
4603 East Central State College
4604 Langston University
4605 Northeastern State College
4606 Northwestern State College
4609 Okla St Univ Main Campus
4612 Oklahoma Baptist Univ
4616 Southeastern State Col
4617 Southwestern State College
4618 Univ Okla Main Campus
4619 University of Tulsa

Oregon
4704 Lewis & Clark College
4712 Oregon College of Educ
4713 Oregon State University
4716 Portland State College
4717 Reed College
4719 Southern Oregon College
4720 Univ Oregon Main Campus
4721 University of Portland
4723 Willamette University
4724 U Oregon, Portland

Pennsylvania
4811 California State College
4813 Cedar Crest College
4831 Gannon College
4842 Juniata College
4855 Mansfield State College
4859 Millersville State College
4884 Penn St Univ Main Campus
4902 Temple University
4910 Univ Pittsbrg Main Cam.
4917 West Chester State Col
4918 Westminster College

Rhode Island
5001 Brown University
5007 Salve Regina College
5009 Univ of Rhode Island

South Carolina
5102 Bob Jones University
5124 South Carolina St Col.

South Dakota
5207 Northern State Col.
5210 S. Dakota State Univ
5212 Univ South Dakota

Tennessee
5310 Geo. Peabody Col Tchrs
5337 Univ Tenn-Knoxville

Texas
5403 Baylor Univ Main Camp.
5406 East Texas State Univ.
5407 Hardin Simmons Univ.
5418 N. Texas State Univ.
5420 Pan American College
5422 Prairie View A&M Col.
5426 Southern Meth. Univ.
5427 Southwest Texas St Col.
5441 Texas Tech. College
5443 Texas Womens Univ.
5447 Univ of Texas/El Paso
5448 Univ Texas at Austin
5453 West Texas State Univ.
5454 Wiley College

Utah
5500 Brigham Young Univ.
5501 College of S. Utah
5507 Utah State Univ.

Vermont
5612 Univ of Vermont

Virginia
5732 Univ Virginia Main Cam.

Washington
5800 Central Washington St Col
5801 E. Washington St Col.
5803 Gonzaga University
5805 Pacific Lutheran Univ.
5806 Seattle Pacific Col.
5810 Univ of Puget Sound
5811 Univ. of Washington
5812 Walla Walla College
5813 Washington St. Univ.
5814 West Washington St Col.
5815 Whitman College
5816 Whitworth College

West Virginia
5916 W Va Univ Main Campus

Wisconsin
6024 Stout St Univ Main Camp.
6025 U of Wis Madison
6026 U of Wis Milwaukee
6031 Wis St Univ Oshkosh
6032 Wis St Univ Platteville
6033 Wis St Univ River Flls
6035 Wis St Univ Superior
6036 Wis St Univ Whitewater

Wyoming
6100 University of Wyoming

9998 All Institutions Outside the U.S.

9999 All Institutions Inside the U.S. NOT LISTED on this sheet. (Please record the name and location on the spaces provided in Question #2.)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CODE SHEET (SIDE 2)

SECTION B: MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY (FOR QUESTION #3)

BUSINESS

01	Accounting
02	Finance
03	Marketing
04	Other Business

EDUCATION

11	Administration
12	Curriculum
13	Early Childhood Ed.
14	Educational Media
15	Distributive Ed.
16	Ed. Pyschology
17	Elementary Ed.
18	Guidance & Counseling
19	Home Economics
20	Industrial Arts
21	M.A. in Teaching
22	Physical Ed.
23	Practical Arts
24	Reading Ed.
25	Special Ed.
26	Speech & Hearing Therapy
27	Speech Pathology
28	Other Education

HUMANITIES

31	Classics
32	Drama
33	English
34	Fine Arts
35	Foreign Languages
36	Music
37	Philosophy
38	Religion
39	Other

SCIENCES

41	Archeology
42	Astronomy
43	Biology
44	Botany
45	Chemistry
46	Computer Science
47	Geography
48	Geology
49	Mathematics
50	Physics
51	Other

SOCIAL SCIENCES

60	American Civilization
61	Anthropology
62	Economics
63	Ethnic Studies
64	Government
65	History
66	Political Science
67	Psychology
68	Sociology
69	Other

OTHER AREAS OF STUDY

70	Agriculture
71	Engineering
72	Journalism
73	Military Science
74	Nurse's Training
75	Social Work
76	Other

SECTION C: JOB ASSIGNMENTS (FOR QUESTION #14)

TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS:

Self-Contained Teaching

0001	Preschool
0002	Kindergarten
0003	Grades 1,2 or 3
0004	Grades 4,5 or 6
0005	Grades 7 or 8
0006	Comb. Class, Highest Grade 3 or Below
0007	Comb. Class, Highest Grade 4 to 8
0008	Other Self-Contained

Departmentalized Teaching

1001	Art
1002	English
1003	Foreign Languages
1004	Health
1005	Mathematics
1006	Music
1007	Physical Education
1008	Safety Education
1009	Science
1010	Social Science
1011	Other

Special Education

2001	Special Class
2002	Resource Teacher
2003	Home or Hosp. Teacher
2004	Nonpublic School Teacher

Vocational Education

3001	Agriculture
3002	Business Education
3003	Marketing and Distribution
3004	Health Education
3005	Consumer & Homemaking
3006	Industrial Arts
3007	Occupational Preparation
3008	Office Education
3009	Technical
3010	Work Exper. Educ
3011	Other

Adult Education

4001	General Education Classes
4002	Vocational Education Classes
4003	Other

SCHOOL SITE ADMINISTRATION ASSIGNMENTS

5001	Principal
5002	Asst./Assoc./Vice Principal
5003	Dean of Students
5004	Asst./Assoc. Dean
5005	Program Supervisor/Coordinator
5006	Dept. Chairperson

STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES ASSIGNMENTS

6001	Counselor (Elem.)
6002	Counselor (Sec.)
6003	Psychologist
6004	Librarian
6005	Social Worker
6006	School Nurse
6007	Resource Specialist
6008	Program Spec. - Spec. Ed.
6009	Therapist
6010	Other

APPENDIX B

SCHOOL AND PERSONNEL FILE WEIGHTS

APPENDIX B

SCHOOL AND PERSONNEL FILE WEIGHTS

A. SCHOOL WEIGHTS

When analyzing a random sample from a single homogeneous population, it is usually appropriate to weight observations equally in statistical calculations. With more complex sampling plans, however, it may be necessary to weight observations differently to obtain unbiased estimates of population parameters. This note describes the construction of four variables containing appropriate weights for various uses of the Public-Private Data Base School File.

There are two reasons why weights for this file are required. First, in selecting the original respondent sample, different proportions of schools were taken in different strata. For example, the population frame included only 29 continuation/non-traditional high schools, all of which were included in the sample. On the other hand, of the 73 junior high schools in the six county Bay Area, only 37 were randomly selected to receive school questionnaires. The second reason for weighting is to reduce nonresponse bias. Of the 933 public and nonpublic schools sampled, only 282 provided usable school questionnaire returns. If it could be assumed that nonresponse was a random occurence, no further adjustment in the weighting would be indicated. If, however, some types of schools responded at different rates than other types, then patterns of response versus nonresponse could introduce systematic biases into the file. To reduce these potential biases, schools were post-stratified according to addtional variables not uses in defining the original sample strata, and respondent schools were weighted to make their distribution on these adiditonal variables match the distribution for the entire sample as closely as possible.

Certain variables, e.g., total enrollment, were available for all schools sampled, regardless of whether or not they returned questionnaires. For these variables, no bias was introduced by nonresponse, and it was sufficient to weight each school inversely according to its probability of inclusion in the sample. Where all schools in a stratum were sampled, each received a weight of one. Where fewer schools were sampled, each received a higher weight. These weights, which were constant within any given stratum and which were defined for all the schools sampled, comprised one of the two preliminary weighting variables.

For variables taken from the school questonnaire returns, a more complex weighting scheme was developed. Post-stratification variables were selected from among those available for all schools sampled, including schools that did not return questionnaires. Within each original sample stratum, schools were crosstabulated according to these additional variables, and the cells of this large crosstabulation were then collapsed to the extent necessary to obtain reasonable frequencies in each collapsed cell. Responding schools in each collapsed cell were then weighted so as to represent the total number of sampled school in the cell. This resulted in a second preliminary weighting variable, defined only for responding schools, and appropriate for analyses involving variables taken from the school questionnaire.

For convenience in carrying out various kinds of analyses, each of the two preliminary weight variables was then scaled in two ways, via multiplication by suitable constants. This resulted in the four weight variables on the final file. WGHTSAMP gives the weight appropriate for variables present for all sampled schools, scaled so that the mean weight across all sampled schools is 1.00. F1000SMP gives the same weight, scaled so that the sum of the weights is 1,000 times the total population size. Values in this weight variable are rounded to the nearest integer, so it can be used as a "FREQ" variable SAS. If this is done, reported frequencies will give rough estimates of population frequencies, multiplied by 1,000. The third variable, WGHTRET, is zero for all sampled schools without school questionnaire returns and positive for all schools with returns. It is scaled such that the mean weight for schools with returns is 1.00. Finally, F1000RET gives the weight appropriate for variables taken from the school questionnaire, scaled such that its sum across all schools with returns equals 1,000 times the number of schools in the population, and rounded to the nearest integer.

The prescise variables used for post-stratification were different for public versus private schools, because different sources of information were available concerning characteristics of all sampled schools in these two sectors. A number of potential variables were considered before final selections were made. Criteria for the final selection of variables for post-stratification were availability, intrinsic importance, and probable correlation with other school characteristics of interest. For public schools, the first stratification variable was public school type, used in the original sample design. This was the only stratification relevant for the construction of WGHTSAMP and F1000SMP. Additional variables used for post-stratificaton within public school types were percent Black students, percent Hispanic students, and total student enrollment. The number of collapsed cells defined by post-stratification variables for public schools ranged from five cells for elementary schools in districts containing from 12 to 20 elementary schoools, to 24 collapsed cells for high schools. A total of 83 strata were defined across all public school types for purposes of weighting.

School enrollments by racial group were not available for many nonpublic schools sampled. Thus, school location was used as a reasonable proxy to racial/ethnic composition. For three of the private school types, Catholic parochial elementary, other religious elementary, and nonsectarian elementary schools, samples sizes were sufficient to stratify by total enrollment as well as location. Using county, whether or not the school was located in a central city area, and enrollment size, 24 collapsed cells were defined for Catholic parochial elementary schools, 9 for other religious elementary schools, and 11 for nonsectarian elementary schools. For the remaining nonpublic school types, sample sizes only permitted stratification according to county and central city/non-central city. Across all nonpublic school types, a total of 68 strata were defined for weighting purposes.

Non-zero values for WGHTSAMP ranged from .583 to 3.881, with a mean of 1.000. Non-zero values of WGHTRET ranged from .164 to 13.070, with a mean of 1.000. While different, more suitable weights might be defined for specific purposes, the four weight variables defined in the present files should meet the needs of the great majority of users.

The final school file includes 12 schools for which questonnaires were returned, but which fell outside the six-county area. For these 12 schools, all weight variables are zero, as they were excluded from the original frame.

B. PERSONNEL FILE WEIGHTS

For the Personnel File, a similar weighting strategy was employed. In order to maximize comparability with the school file weights, the same 83 public school strata and 68 private school strata were used. Four weight variables were constucted. PRINWGHT and PRINFREQ differ only by a scaling factor. Either of these may be used in weighting the principal returns in the personnel file, to obtain estimates representative of the population of principals in the six county area. PRINWGHT gives an average weight of 1.000 to each record in the six county area. (Records from principals outside the area are assigned PRINWGHT = PRINFREQ = 0). PRINFREQ sums to 1,000 times the size of the population, and takes only integer values.

The teacher records in the personnel file may be weighted using the corresponding variables TCHWGHT and TCHFREQ. All teachers within any given school have identical values for these two variables. These weights are constructed to give all teachers equal weight. Thus, using either TCHWGHT or TCHFREQ to weight teacher records yields estimates of parameters for the population of teachers, not schools, in the six county area.

This weighting scheme was developed primarily by Edward Haertel, Assistant Professor in Stanford's School of Education.

APPENDIX C

TABLES ON INFLUENCE OF VARIOUS CONSTITUENCIES ON DECISION-MAKING

TABLE APPENDIX C.1: INFLUENCE OF VARIOUS CONSTITUENCIES ON DECISION-MAKING

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL
SDE-ADMIN INFLUENCE ON CURRICULUM	MEAN RATING	2.3	2.2	0.0	1.7	1.0	2.1
LOCAL GOV BD INFLUENCE ON CURRICULUM	MEAN RATING	4.1	1.6	0.0	1.8	1.9	2.6
ADV CNCL/PASTORS INFL ON CURRICULUM	MEAN RATING	2.6	2.1	0.0	1.1	0.1	1.9
PRINCIPALS INFLUENCE ON CURRICULUM	MEAN RATING	3.9	4.6	5.0	4.5	3.9	4.2
FACULTY INFLUENCE ON CURRICULUM	MEAN RATING	4.1	4.8	5.0	3.9	3.6	4.3
PARENT GROUP INFLUENCE ON CURRICULUM	MEAN RATING	1.5	2.3	0.0	1.2	1.8	1.8
SDE-ADMIN INFLUENCE ON HIRING TEACHERS	MEAN RATING	0.7	1.9	0.0	1.8	1.0	1.3
LOCAL GOV BD INFLUENCE ON HIRING TCHR	MEAN RATING	2.9	0.8	0.0	3.2	1.4	1.9
ADV CNCL/PASTORS INFL ON HIRING TCHR	MEAN RATING	1.0	2.7	0.0	1.8	0.1	1.6
PRINCIPALS INFLUENCE ON HIRING TCHR	MEAN RATING	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.6	4.6
FACULTY IFLUENCE ON HIRING TCHR	MEAN RATING	2.2	2.0	3.0	1.3	2.6	2.1
PARENT GROUP INFLUENCE ON HIRING TCHR	MEAN RATING	0.8	0.9	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.9
SDE-ADMIN INFLUENCE IN DISMISSING TCHR	MEAN RATING	0.9	2.2	5.0	1.6	0.9	1.5
LOCAL GOV BD INFLUENCE IN DISMISS TCHR	MEAN RATING	3.9	1.1	0.0	3.1	1.7	2.4

(CONTINUED)

TABLE APPENDIX C.1: INFLUENCE OF VARIOUS CONSTITUENCIES ON DECISION-MAKING

GRADE LEVEL=ELEMENTARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL
ADV CNCL/PASTORS INFL IN DISMISSG TCHR	MEAN RATING	0.9	3.6	0.0	1.9	0.1	1.9
PRINCIPALS INFLUENCE IN DISMISS TCHR	MEAN RATING	4.5	4.9	5.0	3.0	4.5	4.6
FACULTY INFLUENCE IN DISMISSING TCHR	MEAN RATING	1.2	1.3	3.0	1.1	2.3	1.4
PARENT GROUP INFLUENCE IN DISMISS TCHR	MEAN RATING	0.9	1.2	0.0	0.0	1.7	1.1
SDE-ADMIN INFLUENCE ON STDNT ADMISSIONS	MEAN RATING	2.2	1.7	0.0	1.3	1.0	1.8
LOCAL GOV BD INFLUENCE ON STDNT ADMISS	MEAN RATING	3.4	1.9	0.0	3.3	2.1	2.6
ADV CNCL/PASTORS INFL ON STDNT ADMSSNS	MEAN RATING	0.9	3.6	0.0	1.9	0.1	1.9
PRINCIPAL INFLUENCE ON STDNT ADMISSNS	MEAN RATING	2.5	4.0	5.0	4.6	4.3	3.8
FACULTY INFLUENCE ON STUDENT ADMISSNS	MEAN RATING	1.5	3.4	5.0	3.1	2.0	2.6
PARENT GROUP INFLUENCE ON STDNT ADMSN	MEAN RATING	0.6	1.5	0.0	0.0	1.5	1.1
SDE-ADMIN INFLUENCE IN DETERMINING BUDGET	MEAN RATING	2.0	1.6	0.0	1.2	1.0	1.6
LOCAL GOV BD INFLUENCE IN DETR BUDGET	MEAN RATING	4.0	2.6	0.0	3.3	3.6	3.3
ADV CNCL/PASTORS INFL IN DTRMNG BUDGET	MEAN RATING	2.3	4.1	0.0	1.2	0.1	2.6
PRINCIPAL INFLUENCE IN DETRMING BDGET	MEAN RATING	3.8	4.7	5.0	4.6	4.0	4.3
FACULTY INFLUENCE IN DETERMING BDGET	MEAN RATING	3.0	1.9	4.0	1.0	1.9	2.3
PARENT GROUP INFLUENCE IN DETRM BDGET	MEAN RATING	1.0	1.7	4.0	0.0	1.0	1.3

TABLE APPENDIX C.1: INFLUENCE OF VARIOUS CONSTITUENCIES ON DECISION-MAKING

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL
SDE-ADMIN INFLUENCE ON CURRICULUM	MEAN RATING	1.9	2.4	1.4	1.5	0.1	1.7
LOCAL GOV BD INFLUENCE ON CURRICULUM	MEAN RATING	3.9	1.6	2.2	4.5	1.2	3.4
ADV CNCL/PASTORS INFL ON CURRICULUM	MEAN RATING	2.3	0.6	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.8
PRINCIPALS INFLUENCE ON CURRICULUM	MEAN RATING	4.0	4.2	3.8	5.0	4.8	4.1
FACULTY INFLUENCE ON CURRICULUM	MEAN RATING	4.0	4.6	3.6	4.0	4.9	4.1
PARENT GROUP INFLUENCE ON CURRICULUM	MEAN RATING	1.5	1.6	2.4	1.5	2.1	1.6
SDE-ADMIN INFLUENCE ON HIRING TEACHERS	MEAN RATING	0.7	2.2	1.4	1.5	0.6	0.8
LOCAL GOV BD INFLUENCE ON HIRING TCHR	MEAN RATING	2.9	0.0	0.6	5.0	1.1	2.5
ADV CNCL/PASTORS INFL ON HIRING TCHR	MEAN RATING	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.8
PRINCIPALS INFLUENCE ON HIRING TCHR	MEAN RATING	4.4	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.9	4.5
FACULTY IFLUENCE ON HIRING TCHR	MEAN RATING	2.4	1.6	1.0	2.5	4.0	2.5
PARENT GROUP INFLUENCE ON HIRING TCHR	MEAN RATING	0.8	0.0	0.6	1.0	1.0	0.8
SDE-ADMIN INFLUENCE IN DISMISSING TCHR	MEAN RATING	1.1	3.4	2.0	1.5	0.6	1.3
LOCAL GOV BD INFLUENCE IN DISMISS TCHR	MEAN RATING	4.2	1.2	2.2	5.0	1.0	3.6

(CONTINUED)

TABLE APPENDIX C.1: INFLUENCE OF VARIOUS CONSTITUENCIES ON DECISION-MAKING

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL
ADV CHCL/PASTORS INFL IN DISMISSG TCHR	MEAN RATING	0.7	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.6
PRINCIPALS INFLUENCE IN DISMISS TCHR	MEAN RATING	4.7	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.7
FACULTY INFLUENCE IN DISMISSING TCHR	MEAN RATING	1.6	2.0	2.2	1.8	3.1	1.9
PARENT GROUP INFLUENCE IN DISMISS TCHR	MEAN RATING	0.8	0.8	1.0	1.0	1.1	0.9
SDE-ADMIN INFLUENCE ON STDNT ADMISSIONS	MEAN RATING	1.6	3.0	1.4	1.5	0.6	1.5
LOCAL GOV BD INFLUENCE ON STDNT ADMISS	MEAN RATING	3.4	2.0	2.4	4.5	1.6	3.0
ADV CHCL/PASTORS INFL ON STDNT ADMSSNS	MEAN RATING	0.9	1.2	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.8
PRINCIPAL INFLUENCE ON STDNT ADMISSNS	MEAN RATING	3.2	4.6	3.6	4.5	4.9	3.6
FACULTY INFLUENCE ON STUDENT ADMISSNS	MEAN RATING	1.7	2.4	2.4	3.0	4.1	2.1
PARENT GROUP INFLUENCE ON STDNT ADMSN	MEAN RATING	0.6	1.6	1.2	1.5	1.3	0.8
SDE-ADMIN INFLUENCE IN DETERMINING BUDGET	MEAN RATING	1.8	4.2	1.6	2.0	0.1	1.8
LOCAL GOV BD INFLUENCE IN DETR BUDGET	MEAN RATING	4.1	3.0	2.2	5.0	2.6	3.7
ADV CHCL/PASTORS INFL IN DTRMNG BUDGET	MEAN RATING	1.7	0.6	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.3
PRINCIPAL INFLUENCE IN DETRMNIG BDGET	MEAN RATING	4.0	4.8	4.0	4.5	4.6	4.1

(CONTINUED)

TABLE APPENDIX C.1: INFLUENCE OF VARIOUS CONSTITUENCIES ON DECISION-MAKING

GRADE LEVEL=SECONDARY

		CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL TYPE					
		PUBLIC	CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL OR DIOCESAN	CATHOLIC PRIVATE	OTHER RELIGIOUS	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL
FACULTY INFLUENCE IN DETERMING BDGET	MEAN RATING	2.6	2.2	2.6	2.0	1.0	2.5
PARENT GROUP INFLUENCE IN DETRM BDGET	MEAN RATING	0.8	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.1	0.9